



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

Daily Report

Soviet Union

**FBIS-SOV-90-118
Tuesday
19 June 1990**

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-118

CONTENTS

19 June 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Big Step Forward' at Vienna Talks Hailed [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun] 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Text of Warsaw Pact Communique Published [TASS] 2
 East Europe Officials View Warsaw Pact's Role [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun] 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Review of Two Germany's Military Capability Urged [Hamburg BILD 16 Jun] 5
 NATO Air Force Exercises Reported [TASS] 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Pentagon 'More Intent' on New Weapons [TASS] 6
 Baker Rebuke to Israel on Peace Talks Cited [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun] 6
 Regional Consensus Fails To Touch Mideast [PRAVDA 10 Jun] 6
 U.S. Delegation Discusses Maritime Convention [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun] 8
 U.S. Naval Self-Defense Rules Questioned [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun] 8
 Science Academy, U.S. Firm Sign Agreement [TASS] 9

China

Alekseyev on China's Nuclear Disarmament Stance [Moscow International] 9
 Rear Admiral Khuzokov on China Relations [Moscow International] 10
 Predicts 'Friendly Contacts' [Moscow International] 10

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev-No Tae-u Summit 'Deal' Denied [TASS] 10
 ROK's Sin Hyon-hwak on Soviet Ties, Korea [Moscow International] 11
 Reportage on Visit by Governor of Hokkaido 12
 Meets With Yakovlev [TASS] 12
 Meets Council of Ministers [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jun] 12
 Yokomichi, Titarenko on Northern Islands [Tokyo KYODO] 12
 Petrovskiy Meets Japanese Group, Dialogue Urged [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun] 12

Near East & South Asia

Israel's Shamir Rules Out PLO From Talks [TASS] 13
 Economic Minister Katushev Meets Libyan Group [TASS] 13
 Accords Reached, Talks End [TASS] 13
 Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Afghan Leaders [TASS] 14
 Increased Aid for Afghanistan, Trade Urged [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Jun] 14
 Afghanistan Since Soviet Pullout Viewed 16
 Part I [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jun] 16
 Part II [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Jun] 18

Sub-Saharan Africa

Committee Cables ANC on Soweto Anniversary [TASS]	19
More on Solidarity With ANC [Moscow International]	19
Commentary on South Africa's Economic Problems [Sholotin on Moscow International] ...	20
Sanctions on S. Africa Cause 'Economic Hardship' [Johannesburg SOWETAN 13 Jun]	21

East Europe

First Stage of Troop Withdrawal From CSFR Ends [TASS]	22
Complete Withdrawal Expected by Feb [Vienna ORF]	22
Economic Problems Beset New CSFR Government [Moscow International]	22
GDR's Gysi Meets Newsmen After Moscow Talks [TASS]	23
Polish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 18 Jun [Moscow Radio]	23
Meets With Lukyanov [TASS]	23
'Unofficially' Told of POW Graves [Warsaw PAP]	23
Polish Consul Demands Official Stand on Graves [Warsaw PAP]	24
Border Crossing Procedures at Moldavia Simplified [Moscow TV]	24
Protests Against Romanian Government Continue [Moscow TV]	24

West Europe

Reportage on Shevardnadze Visit With Genscher	25
Arrives in Munster 18 Jun [TASS]	25
Conveys Gorbachev's Greetings [TASS]	25
NATO, Pact, German Unity Discussed [TASS]	25
More on German Unity [PRAVDA 19 Jun]	26
Merge of NATO-Pact Viewed [Moscow TV]	26
Genscher Comments on Talks [TASS]	27
Shevardnadze Leaves for Moscow [TASS]	28
Pilot Lands Aircraft in Turkey, Seeks Asylum [AFP]	28
More on German Pilot's Intrusion of Airspace [IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]	28
Aeroflot Hijacker Seeks Asylum in Finland [TASS]	29
Hijackers Armed With Grenade [TASS]	29
Finnish Congress on Baltics, Environment [IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	29
UK's Thatcher Seeks To Reduce Armed Forces [IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	29

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine Parliamentarians Meet Komplektov [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	30
Confer With Supreme Soviet Official [IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]	30
Nicaraguan Troop Reduction Plan Submitted [TASS]	30
Contras' Demobilization Still Incomplete [TASS]	31
Nicaraguan Political, Economic Problems Viewed [PRAVDA 19 May]	31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Correction to Gorbachev's Speech to Supreme Soviet	33
Comparison of Gorbachev Supreme Soviet Address	35
Comparison of Ryzhkov Supreme Soviet Report	36

Political & Social

Official Denies Gorbachev To Be Replaced [AFP]	39
Girenko Examines Interethnic Problems [Moscow TV]	39
Soviet Plane Hijacked From Danube 18 Jun	40
Headed Toward Turkey [TASS]	40
Hijacker Identified [Moscow Radio]	40
Chilean Magazine Interviews Boris Yeltsin [Santiago COSAS 12 Jun]	40

Miners' Resolution Defying Communist Party [AFP]	41
Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress	42
Medvedev Chairs Preparatory Session [TASS]	42
Precongress Platforms Compared [TRUD 8 Jun]	42
Consolidation Discussed [PRAVDA 13 Jun]	45
Second CPSU-Marxist Platform Meeting Held	50
Opens 16 Jun [Moscow Radio]	50
Supporters Meet [Moscow Radio]	50
Parliamentary Republic System Viewed [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 24]	50
Justice Minister Yakovlev Discusses Court Reform [PRAVDA 13 Jun]	51
Draft USSR Law on Public Associations [PRAVDA 4 Jun]	53
1975 Leningrad AES Accident Admitted [Helsinki Radio]	57
Trans-Antarctic Explorers Meet Leaders	58
Meet Shevardnadze [TASS]	58
Meet Lukyanov [TASS]	58
Lukyanov Meets With Soviet Buddhist Leader [IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	58
Primakov Visits PRAVDA Offices 13 Jun [PRAVDA 14 Jun]	58
Moscow Procuracy Taking Action Over Antisemitism [TASS]	59
Moscow Filmmakers Union Formed [Moscow Radio]	59
CPSU Launches New GLASNOST Magazine [PRAVDA 15 Jun]	59
Christian Newspaper Issued in Donetsk [Moscow Radio]	59

Economic

PRAVDA 'Forced' To Resume Six-Page Format [PRAVDA 16 Jun]	59
Price Formation, Compensation Discussed [PRAVDA 15 Jun]	60
Resolution on Enactment of Enterprise Law [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jun]	61
Law on State Tax Inspectorates Published [IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]	61
New Securities Exchange Opens in Moscow [Moscow International]	63
Western Banks Cut Credits to USSR [Belgrade TANJUG]	63
Leaseholders' Union President Outlines Aims [Moscow TV]	64
Consumer Cooperative Expands Rural Amenities [Moscow TV]	64
Car Production Slowed by Steel, Plastic Shortages [Moscow TV]	65
Liquor Plant's Successful Conversion Profiled [Moscow TV]	65
Aviation Minister Approves Kamchatka Airline Plan [Moscow TV]	66
Vorkuta Coal Chief Rebuts Miners' Complaint [IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]	67
Miners Vote To Establish Independent Union [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	67
Strikes Blamed for Railroad Punctuality Decline [Moscow TV]	67

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts To Conduct Scientific Experiments [Moscow International]	68
Space Biology Conference Opens in Kaluga [TASS]	68

Military

Lopatyn Comments on Military Reform, Conversion [NEDELYA No 22]	68
Military Academy Officer on Military Reform [Moscow International]	71
Armed Forces Reform Program To Be Televised [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]	71
Payment Sought for Army Property in Hungary [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]	71
USSR Servicemen Honored With Valor Awards [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]	73

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Supreme Soviet Not To Consider Moratorium [Moscow TV]	74
Supreme Council Commissions View Moratorium [TASS]	74
Government Proposal for 'Moratorium' Noted [Vilnius Radio]	74
Moscow To Restore Gas Supply to Lithuanian Plant [AFP]	74
Antiblockade Commission Views Energy Situation [Vilnius Radio]	75

Landsbergis Discusses Economic Blockade, Yeltsin [Vienna PROFIL 11 Jun]	75
Landsbergis Addresses 15 June Supreme Council [Vilnius Radio]	76
Prunskiene Addresses 15 June Supreme Council [Vilnius Radio]	77
Landsbergis Views Declaration of Independence [Prague CTK]	78
Landsbergis Asks Leningrad To Host Conference [Vilnius Radio]	78
Bakucionis Reports Dismissal From Procuracy [Vilnius International]	79
Prunskiene, Ozolas Depart for Greece via Moscow [Vilnius Radio]	79
Supreme Soviet Adopts 'Occupation' Statement [Moscow TV]	79
Report on 14-15 May Latvian Supreme Soviet [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 16 May]	79
Latvian Parliament Sets Out Agenda [Riga Radio]	81
Latvia Front Chairman Gives Interview [Warsaw PAP]	81
Nationalist Paramilitary Force Revived in Latvia [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	82
Survey Shows Latvian Groups Differ on Secession [TASS]	82
Riga Radio Reports Airline Hijacking	83
Latvia's Ivans Interviewed at Baltic Assembly [Moscow TV]	83
Baltic Assembly Envisages Unity of Policies [Vilnius Radio]	83

RSFSR

Reportage on 19 June Russian Party Conference [Moscow TV]	84
Conference Opens	84
Voting Commission Proposed	84
Presidium Membership Noted	84
Agenda Proposed	84
Procedural Matters Discussed	85
Media Coverage Viewed	86
Standing Orders Vote Noted	86
Gorbachev Speaks	86
Gorbachev Urges Market Economy	86
Gorbachev Endorses New Party	87
Gorbachev Addresses Russian Party Conference [TASS]	87
Committee Member Criticizes CPSU Leadership [TASS]	88
TASS Reports on Opening of Conference	88
Formation of Russian Communist Party Discussed [TASS]	88
CPSU Officials View Possible Russian Party [TASS]	89
Moscow CPSU Chief on Genesis of Russian Party [TASS]	89
Moscow TV Relays 18 June Congress Proceedings	90
Agenda Announced	90
Silayev Speaks	90
Deputies Question Silayev	91
Silayev Confirmed	92
Decree on Power Debated	92
Decree Vote Noted	93
Zarubin Outlines Program	94
Zarubin Nomination Debated	95
Mass Media Law Proposed	96
Silayev Addresses 18 June RSFSR Congress [Moscow TV]	96
18 June RSFSR Congress Session Summarized [TASS]	100
Resolution Issued on Silayev Appointment [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Jun]	100
Moscow Commodities Exchange Called 'Major Step' [TASS]	100
Sobchak Outlines Program for Leningrad [LENISGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 26 May]	101
Chelyabinsk Jail 'Disturbances' Explained [TASS]	102
Casualties Reported [Moscow TV]	103
KGB Seizes Machine Guns Smuggled From Plant [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]	103
Ryazan Oblast Party Chief Re-elected [PRAVDA 14 Jun]	104
Situation in Vladivostok City Soviet Cited [Moscow Radio]	104

Western Republics

Ukrainian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum [PRAVDA 14 Jun]	104
Ukrainian Party Rescinds Decisions of 1940s-1950s [TASS]	104

Party Official Views 'Very Acute' Problem [Kiev International]	105
Ukraine's Masol Addresses Parliament [Kiev Radio]	105
Ivashko on Parliament Chairmanship, Yeltsin [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 24]	106
Ivashko on Sovereignty, Democratic Bloc [PRAVDA UKRAINY 22 May]	107
Ukraine's Balkan Peoples Form Association [TASS]	109
New Research Group Founded in Ukraine [Moscow Radio]	110
Chernobyl Cleanup Participants Meet in Panevezys [Vilnius Radio]	110
Socioecological Union Formed in Belorussia [SOYUZ No 18]	110
Belorussian Supreme Soviet Proceeds to Elections [PRAVDA 5 Jun]	111
Moldavian Deputies Set Up Dnestr Economic Region [IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]	111
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Chairman Gives Speech [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 27 May]	112
Broadcasting Changes Envisaged in Moldavia [Moscow TV]	113
Moldavian Quake Damage in 'Millions of Rubles' [IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]	113

Caucasus

37 Servicemen Killed in Transcaucasus Since Jan [TASS]	113
Moscow Berated for Azerbaijan Disorders [PRAVDA 13 Jun]	113
Azerbaijan Congress Decision on NKAO Reported [Baku Radio]	116
Azerbaijan Road Transport Minister Approved [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 6 Jun]	116
Kel'badzharskiy, Il'ichevskiy Regions Attacked	116
Four Armenians Arrested [Baku Radio]	116
Tension Reported [Baku Radio]	117
Azerbaijani Worker Wounded [Baku Radio]	117

Central Asia

'Fragile Peace' in Osh as Death Toll Reaches 186 [TASS]	117
Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet Session Opens 18 Jun [Moscow TV]	117
Uzbek Discusses Economic Independence at Meeting [Tashkent Radio]	118
22d Uzbekistan Communist Party Congress Closes	118
Congress Examined [Moscow TV]	118
Discusses Market Economy [TASS]	119
Warns Against 'Hasty' Change [PRAVDA 7 Jun]	119
Uzbek Shoppers Deplore Temporary Curb on Sales [Moscow TV]	119
Tajik Public Warned on Spreading 'Rumors' [Dushanbe Radio]	120
Six People Die in Tajikistan Landslide [TASS]	120
Kazakh Social Democratic Party Outlines Plans [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jun]	120
Kirghiz Party Congress Ends, Biryukova Present [Moscow TV]	121
Kravtsev Leads Kirghiz Investigatory Group [TASS]	121
Kirghiz Youth Demands for Land Increase [KOMсомOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 May]	121
New Turkmen Supreme Soviet Leader Appointed [TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 27 May]	122
New Turkmen Central Committee Chief Elected [TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 27 May]	122
Orazsakhmatov Appointed Turkmen Gas Supply Chief [TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 27 May]	122

'Big Step Forward' at Vienna Talks Hailed

*PM1806131190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Tosunyan under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Vienna Talks: A Big Step Forward"]

[Text] Vienna—A big step forward has been made at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe. An accord has been reached which certainly makes possible the resolution of the difficult problem of reducing tanks and armored vehicles.

At the plenary session 14 June the heads of the French and Polish delegations announced the results of discussions in working groups and agreements on the levels of reduction. Thus, for example, it is proposed that both of the alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Pact—possess no more than 20,000 tanks. This includes all tracked tanks and wheeled tanks which weigh 16.5 tonnes and above. As far as armored vehicles are concerned—and they subdivide into three groups: infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, and armored vehicles with heavy armaments—neither alliance is allowed to have more than 30,000 of these. In addition, specific levels have been set for each of the groups.

In the general opinion of the participants in the Vienna talks, the problem of reducing tanks and armored vehicles was almost insurmountable. Experts labored over its

resolution for approximately six months. The point is that it is these very categories of weapons that are considered the most dangerous from the military viewpoint. They are associated with the most widespread idea about the military threat and offensive potential of conventional armed forces. The sides could not determine acceptable levels at all. The rate of dialogue slowed down during the last two rounds and the work of the committees and commissions faltered. Some NATO countries took a tough stance on the question of light tanks, trying to remove restrictions on them, thus obtaining unilateral advantages. Rumors started circulating that the Vienna talks might reach deadlock. However, good sense gained the upper hand. The difficulties were overcome. Now restrictions will embrace all types of armored combat vehicles including light tanks.

The significant progress in the talks at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna is connected here with the success of the recent Washington summit. The U.S. and USSR presidents gave a constructive impetus to the dialogue in Vienna. Without touching on the details of the Vienna talks, they pointed out the need to speed up the talks so that a draft treaty on the reduction of conventional armed forces is ready by fall.

And here is the first result. The solution to a very difficult problem has been found. And this was done with consideration for the security concerns and interests of each of the sides.

Text of Warsaw Pact Communiqué Published

LD1506174490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1626 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, 15 June (TASS)—A communiqué from the meeting of the Defense Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states was distributed here today. The document's text follows:

"A meeting of the Defense Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states was conducted in Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic, 14-15 June. [passage omitted listing participants of meeting; list can be found on page 2 of the 15 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

"In addition, the sitting was attended by representatives of the leading staff of the Warsaw Pact member states' defense ministries and of the Joint Command of the Joint Armed Forces.

"The minister of disarmament and defense of the German Democratic Republic chaired the sitting.

"The participants in the Defense Ministers' Committee meeting exchanged opinions on the development of the military and political situation in Europe, summed up 35 years of activity by the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and noted its role as a stabilizing factor. "Stemming from the decisions of the Moscow (1990) conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states, there was consideration of questions about a review of the military organization's activities and its radical restructuring as well; of the joint armed forces and the areas for their improvement, with consideration being made of giving their structure a strictly defensive character and of measures to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments; and of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the allied states' territory.

"The Defense Ministers' Committee stressed the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the accords to reduce strategic offensive arms and eliminate chemical weapons. The results achieved at the Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe were assessed positively, and the joint view was expressed that these negotiations need to be sped up.

"It was confirmed that thanks to the mounting level of trust between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the North Atlantic bloc, a real opportunity arises for their relationship gradually to be given a nonconfrontational character and for their active participation in developing the all-European security system's structures.

"The Defense Ministers' Committee notes at the same time this goal would be furthered if the trends toward change in NATO were accelerated and intensified, and if the decisions being adopted by it concerning changing the North Atlantic Alliance's activities were to be put on

a practical footing, something that would provide confirmation of sincerity and goodwill.

"It was stressed at the session that the Warsaw Pact member states would continue to be guided in their military policy by a defensive military doctrine.

"The Defense Ministers' Committee adopted appropriate decisions on the matters under discussion.

"The session was businesslike and constructive."

East Europe Officials View Warsaw Pact's Role

PM1906101790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by A. Golts "The Warsaw Pact's Future"]

[Text] It so happened that there was no need to specially think up a theme for the discussion on international problems held within the framework of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's festival. After all, a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, which deserved to be called a milestone, was held in Moscow literally the day before.

The times when the allied countries adhered to a single position on practically all questions discussed are now in the past. Today they seek accord on a wide range of opinions and approaches. And those who came to the discussion had the opportunity to find out at first hand, so to speak, about all the subtle distinctions in our allies' positions. After all, Major General Lajos Krasznai, Hungarian military and air force attache; Division General Mieczyslaw Dachowski, Polish military, air force, and naval attache; and their Czechoslovak colleague Major General Vaclav Tomarek participated in the discussion. Soviet military international journalists participated in the debate.

"I myself witnessed the complexity of the beginning of direct relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact," Division General Dachowski said. "In 1988, only two years ago, the first meeting took place between these two blocs. And I must say that it bore the whole burden of mutual mistrust and suspicion which had accumulated during the years of confrontation. But this meeting was not easy either. Back then we dealt with military doctrines and other concrete questions of military building and, despite excessive mutual reproaches, we managed to clarify many important questions."

The military plays a special role in the process of disarmament and the strengthening of security, Gen. Dachowski stressed. These people know the destructive force of modern weapons better than other people because of their position. And therefore, looking into the future with hope, we are acutely aware of the fact that too many of these weapons have accumulated in Europe. And that is why stability must be guaranteed during the transitional period on the continent. It is with that aim that the Warsaw Pact and NATO military organizations

must cooperate with one another. Looking back into the past, Gen. Dachowski concluded, we can say with conviction that the Warsaw Pact has played an important role in ensuring security in Europe in the complex postwar period.

Gen. Krasznai started his address with a reference to history. He did this in order to clarify his state's position with respect to the Warsaw Pact. History, he stressed, has never known any kind of alliance between states to last forever. After all, numerous internal political and economic factors—which also determine the external policy of a state—change. Of course the uniform ideological basis of the Warsaw Pact has undergone changes in the present time.

And this can be seen clearly in the example of Hungary. The one-party state, Gen. Krasznai noted, has turned into a multiparty state. A government is in power which pursues a completely different policy from the previous ones. It must be said clearly that the new Hungarian leadership does not have the building of socialism as its aim but openly declares the contrary—the creation of a bourgeois-liberal state.

And this in itself determines its attitude to participation in the Warsaw Pact. The Hungarian Government believes that history has convincingly shown that the country has never achieved anything by joining any alliance. Therefore only neutrality can bring prosperity. That is why we have set ourselves the aim of leaving the Warsaw Pact. According to Hungarian legislators, participation in the alliance's military organization must be radically decreased or suspended altogether before the end of next year. Parliament deems it impossible to carry out military exercises with the participation of the armed forces of other states on Hungarian territory.

In his speech, Gen. Krasznai tried to argue that Budapest had a realistic approach. Thus, according to him, Hungarian leaders realize that it is necessary to remain in the Warsaw Pact while the Vienna talks are going on. After all, they are going on between two military and political alliances.

CSFR military attache Maj. Gen. Vaclav Tomarek paid particular attention to the role of the Warsaw Pact military organization in the transitional period—the period of the transformation of the blocs into political-military alliances. The following question arises: what is now going to happen to the Joint Armed Forces? In our president's opinion, Gen. Tomarek stressed, Czechoslovakia will be able to carry out its functions within the framework of the alliance if the alliance itself adheres to a number of principles. And the main one of these is respect for the sovereignty and independence of all the countries which are participants. The events of 1968 must not be repeated. The president demands the full sovereignty of every state over its own armed forces. At the same time, their use outside the boundaries of the national territories must be completely ruled out.

Although no military attaches from NATO countries participated in the discussion, the latest documents adopted by that organization's leading organs were the subject of detailed discussion. The words of the final communique of the NATO Council's session were quoted during the discussion. This document says, for example, that the NATO countries intend to promote the building of a new peaceful order on the continent. In this spirit, the NATO countries are extending the hand of friendship and cooperation to the Soviet Union and other East European countries.

Analyzing this document, Colonel V. Pogrebenkov noted that two aspects of the North Atlantic bloc's current policy must be outlined: the military and the political. As far as the political statement is concerned, both its spirit and its letter should be welcomed and approved today. However, it is no secret that on a military level NATO is at the same time continuing to strengthen its armed forces, adapting them to the changes that are taking place.

Colonel V. Solovyev supported this idea. The progress in the discussion that is going on at present, he noted, is creating the impression that universal security is within arm's reach. However, the problems are not that simple. As an example, Col. V. Solovyev cited the difficulties in the conference on "open skies."

The problem of German unification provoked the intense interest of all the participants in the debate. It was probably necessary to be in the hall and hear the questions being asked one after another to understand that the Soviet people's interest in this problem is far from idle.

The USSR's bilateral relations with allied countries provoked many questions too. In particular, veterans who participated in the discussion asked questions about anti-Soviet manifestations and incidents in which monuments to Soviet servicemen had been damaged in Poland. Answering these questions, Gen. Dachowski noted that this was a matter only of individual attacks by small groups of which the majority of people in Poland did not approve. Many views are changing, he noted. Thus, for instance, no one in Poland is asking questions about the withdrawal of Soviet troops. And even those who recently demanded that these troops leave Polish territory are now saying that they should not do so.

However, as is well known, our troops are leaving Hungary and Czechoslovakia. For this reason the issue was raised of why questions of compensation for the buildings and other facilities left behind were not regulated beforehand. Maj. Gen. Krasznai said that this was because the adoption of the decision to withdraw troops and the signing of the relevant documents had been quite rapid, and the fact that individual questions were not agreed was the price paid for speedy action.

Some people may not be satisfied with the explanations and views expressed by the allied countries' representatives. But let us remember that they are expressing their governments' views. The age of unanimity in the Warsaw Pact will clearly never return. But all the participants must reach accord if this alliance is to continue playing a positive role in Europe. And that accord evidently was achieved, not only at the Political Consultative Committee session but also during the debate at the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA festival.

And furthermore: The view has been generally accepted for some time now that our society is gradually losing interest in international problems. However, the meeting at the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA festival has shown that this is not true. Our readers argued heatedly and made sharp and forceful speeches. And I think that such contact was very useful to our guests. It was also very useful to us KRASNAYA ZVEZDA journalists, forcing us to look at many things in a different way.

Review of Two Germany's Military Capability Urged
AU1606144690 Hamburg BILD in German 16 Jun 90
pp 1, 8

[Interview with General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Supreme Command, by Karl-Ludwig Guensche in Moscow; date not given: "Lobov: 'Dissolve Bundeswehr and National People's Army!'"]

[Text] [Guensche] Is the Warsaw Pact dead?

[Lobov] No, we are still alive.

[Guensche] But the GDR will withdraw in any case....

[Lobov] There are many possibilities, which now have to be negotiated. Version one: The National People's Army [NVA] remains in the Warsaw Pact, the Bundeswehr remains in NATO. Version two: The NVA is dissolved, the only thing that remains is the Bundeswehr. Version three: The NVA becomes a territorial army and is thus not subordinate to NATO and is not merged with the Bundeswehr.

For us the version in which the NVA is merged with the Bundeswehr and is put into NATO is unacceptable. Because this would strongly disturb the balance of power in Europe.

[Guensche] You want the guarantee that the danger of war can never again start from Germany?

[Lobov] A final end must be put to World War II—in the form of a peace treaty or of another agreement.

[Guensche] How long will Soviet troops still be stationed in a united Germany?

[Lobov] As long as there are still U.S. troops there. But we are for withdrawing all foreign troops from foreign territories—also from Germany.

[Guensche] And how big would the German forces then be permitted to be?

[Lobov] Whether they comprise 150,000 or 250,000 soldiers must be set down in the "two-plus-four" negotiations or in Vienna. For us the main thing is: The military potential of the united Germany must be capable of defense but never of attack.

I make the following proposal: Since Germany is not threatened by anyone and does not want to attack any other state itself, it does not need any armed forces. The Bundeswehr and the NVA could be dissolved, a territorial army is sufficient. This would be the best security guarantee for us and it would make the path toward unity easier.

NATO Air Force Exercises Reported

LD1806163390 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin]

[Text] Bonn June 18 TASS—About 500 military aircraft from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, West Germany and other NATO countries are taking part in the central Enterprise-90 air-force exercises, which began today in the air space over West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark and France.

France is not a member of NATO's military structures, but its air forces are taking part in the games under an agreement on joint military training.

Military aircraft will avoid flying at low altitudes, the DPA West German news agency said.

United States & Canada

Pentagon 'More Intent' on New Weapons

LD1806220690 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Pentagon seems now more intent on using novel technologies to create new means of mass destruction and pays little attention to national security interests or the military-political situation in the world.

New military technologies go into production, and only after that they get strategic substantiation.

The United States is now considering building maneuverable nuclear war-heads capable of piercing anti-missile defenses. This is a rather old project. The U.S. Administration abandoned it after signing the ABM Treaty in the 1970s.

Despite the current international thaw, the project has again been taken up by Pentagon.

Robert Barker, assistant to the secretary of defence for atomic energy, spoke in a secret congressional testimony recently made public about work on an earth-penetrating warhead for attacking underground military-political command centres and a new nuclear depth bomb.

Pentagon is now considering the development of the hypervelocity glide vehicle, a winged nuclear missile that could evade defenses while plunging toward targets at supersonic speed. This is also a destabilising first-strike weapon.

The production of nuclear warheads is increasing, although in 1990 it will be lower than expected.

Warheads deliveries were supposed to go up 27 per cent in 1990, according to a transcript of Barker's comments at a closed hearing of a house appropriations panel.

Production will, however, fall below target, but not because of the normalisation of the military-political situation in the world, but due to slips in U.S. military programmes.

Meanwhile, new varieties of nuclear warheads are being developed.

The U.S. military production machine has become a thing in itself that is by no means connected with national security requirements.

The Pentagon finds it difficult to convince tax-payers in the need to increase the U.S. nuclear potential. U.S. military leaders, however, seem unperturbed. They used to frighten Americans with the "Soviet military threat". Now they are resorting to abstruse rhetoric.

The U.S. modernisation programme should continue until such time as "we have a better chance to evaluate the direction this new future world will take us," Barker said.

Meanwhile, Senator John Warner, a Republican member of the Armed Forces Committee, maintains that changes in the Soviet Union make the U.S. Star Wars programme even more necessary because of growing political and military instability in the world.

According to Pentagon logic, rain or shine in the international situation, the United States should continue its nuclear build-up.

Baker Rebuke to Israel on Peace Talks Cited

PM1806153790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch: "United States—Israel: Appeal for Compromise"]

[Text] Washington—Words of criticism with respect to Israel, unusual for U.S. legislators, were voiced last Wednesday within the walls of Congress.

Addressing the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker expressed bewilderment at the telegram from Tel Aviv that he had just read. It said that the ministers in Y. Shamir's new cabinet considered that the plan for holding "Israeli-Palestinian dialogue" put forward by Washington had "become pointless."

As the secretary of state noted, the Palestinians were prepared to start dialogue with the Israeli Government on the so-called "Shamir plan" and subsequent peace talks, but the Israeli prime minister had given no affirmative answer to proposals on who was to be in the Palestinian delegation.

The new Israeli parliament has adopted an even more obstructionist stance.

"With such an attitude, with such an approach, there can be no dialogue, and there can be no peace," the secretary of state declared. "The United States cannot guarantee it. Neither you, nor I, nor the President are in a position to guarantee it."

Insisting that the Israeli parliament must demonstrate its readiness for new approaches and do so quickly, Baker proposed that it use the White House switchboard. "I am informing you of the telephone number, and let everyone over there know it: 1-202-456-1414. When you are serious about wanting peace—call us."

Regional Consensus Fails To Touch Mideast

PM1106150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Yuriy Glukhov commentary: "From Words to Action; View From Moscow"]

[Text] David Nagle, a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, visited our editorial office. He is the author of a number of important bills submitted to the Congress recently. They include the "Bill on Economic Cooperation" and a "Trade Bill" which validate the need to broaden economic ties with the Soviet Union and East Europe and abolish all discriminatory restrictions, including the Jackson-Vanik amendment. However, the purpose of the U.S. congressman's call at the PRAVDA office was to draw attention not so much to these documents as to another legislative initiative, also proposed by him. We are referring to the "peaceful solution of regional conflicts caused by the 'cold war.'"

One cannot fail to agree with most of the arguments he uses to substantiate this legislative act. The arguments are, as usual, more than sufficient. But evidently it is time to move away from words and toward action. The U.S. congressman proposes his own version of this step. The pivot of his draft law is a mutual ban on military aid to the sides involved in the armed conflict in Afghanistan. In line with this, the United States "refuses to give any aid that could be used directly or indirectly to enhance the combat ability of any group engaged in military or paramilitary operations in Afghanistan." An indispensable condition of this is that a similar legislative act is adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

It also stipulates that any military aid to Pakistan, including the supply of military equipment and military services to that country, must be accompanied by guarantees on its part that the arms received will not be used directly or indirectly to enhance the combat ability of any group engaged in military or paramilitary operations in Afghanistan.

Essentially, D. Nagle's legislative proposals are already enshrined in the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, of which the United States and the Soviet Union are guarantors. However, the sad reality is that many provisions of the Geneva accords have remained nothing more than good intentions. Just as the idea of "negative symmetry"—a mutual refusal to supply arms to the warring sides—which we support, has been rejected. The international legal mechanism clearly is not working. Evidently it is for this reason that Nagle is proposing to also involve the mechanism of our two countries' state legislation. I believe that this idea deserves attention.

It is gratifying that our countries are gradually moving in the direction of collaboration and away from confrontation in the zone of regional conflicts.

The Soviet Union and the United States issued a joint statement on the regional problem at the Washington summit. Both countries supported the idea of convening an international government conference on the settlement of conflict situations in the region of the Horn of Africa. On this occasion special attention was devoted to conflicts aggravating the hunger problem. The sides expressed willingness to work together to resolve this

problem. They discussed the necessary aid and the prospects of a political solution to the internal conflict in Ethiopia.

Actually, the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan were the first element in fashioning the political weather. And although their full implementation has been blocked, they have given impetus to the constructive search for solutions in other regions. For example, the hotbed of tension in South West Africa has been extinguished as a result of coordinated actions involving the United Nations and U.S. and Soviet diplomacy. Namibia has secured its independence. The zone of collaboration is broadening further, to include such regions as Nicaragua, Cambodia, and the Near East.

At the Washington meeting, for example, the U.S. president confirmed the invariability of U.S. policy regarding settlement in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories: The United States is opposed to new settlements beyond the 1967 line. We have a right to expect that Washington will demonstrate total consistency by also opposing any attempts to channel the stream of Jewish immigrants, including those from the Soviet Union, in that direction and supporting demands for the corresponding guarantees from the Israeli authorities. I also think that it is in U.S. interests to seek comprehensive solutions rather than separate solutions to the Near East conflict.

It would be naive to suppose that the change of approach to the solution of global conflicts is evidence of a compact between the great powers or a surrender of positions by one of them. The world is indivisible. The process of detente connected with the new thinking is changing the political climate throughout the world. It would be absurd to remain in the "cold war" trenches on the periphery, abandoning progress along the central thrust.

At the same time, let us remember how the solution of global problems has slipped in the past on the banana peel (!) of regional conflicts. How the SALT-II Treaty was shelved, for example, with the introduction of Soviet troops into Afghanistan serving as the reason or grounds. Any repetition of such situations would be too unforgivable a luxury for the cause of peace. This is a further argument in favor of detente throughout the world.

Finally, the stereotyped perception of regional conflicts as confrontation between the great powers is crashing to the ground. This stereotype was used as the basis, for example, of the "small wars" theory and the view that confrontation was permissible in peripheral regions. Adaptation of the new political thinking is smashing this stereotype and thereby making it more difficult to conceal interference in others' affairs behind the propaganda curtain of "opposing the Soviet threat" and "rolling back communism."

In the Near East, for example, these kind of arguments are not working. Washington's all-round military-political and economic support for Israel is seen by the

Arabs as support for the Israeli occupation of the Arab lands and the flouting of their legitimate rights. At a recent inter-Arab summit conference, this course was described as anti-Arab. The Kuwaiti press recently reported that the United States has used its veto against the Arabs 60 times in the United Nations Security Council in its efforts to defend Israel. Involvement in a regional conflict often leads to direct confrontation with the peoples of the region without producing any benefit. Hence the natural reaction of trying to extinguish hotbeds of tension.

Returning to Afghanistan, I will remind you that our deep interest in settling the conflict has been reflected at legislative level. The Congress of USSR People's Deputies has given a political assessment of the decision to introduce Soviet troops into that country, expressing moral and political condemnation. Having thrown off the burden of the past, the Soviet Union is all the more open to any peace initiatives in any hot spot.

U.S. Delegation Discusses Maritime Convention

*PM1806160790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks at the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] On 14 June A.A. Obukhov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received a U.S. delegation headed by T. Skalli, chief of the U.S. State Department's Maritime Policy Department, which is holding consultations at the USSR Foreign Ministry on questions of interpreting and implementing the provisions of the 1982 UN Convention on Maritime Law which concerns navigation and maritime jurisdiction.

U.S. Naval Self-Defense Rules Questioned

*PM1406160090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 3*

[Captain 2d Rank V. Trofimov report: "In Theory and in Practice: How the 'Right to Self-Defense' Is Implemented in the U.S. Navy"]

[Text] War talk by men who have been in a war is always interesting; whereas moon talk by a poet who has not been in the moon is likely to be dull. These words of Mark Twain's were used by naval chief of staff Admiral C. Trost three years ago to open his program exposition in the pages of the American naval journal NAVAL INSTITUTE PROCEEDINGS, in the article "View and Prospects of U.S. Naval Strategy."

My generation did not have the opportunity to participate in military operations. But all the same, by the time you have gone up the ladder, as a naval officer, as high as ship's commanding officer, by the time you make the transition from the captain's bridge to the chair of international maritime law at a military academy, you form your own opinion, based on personal experience, of

the actions of naval forces on the high seas. Of the danger they represent to the cause of peace.

Unfortunately the multilateral documents that make up present-day international maritime law do not touch on the questions of tactical and operational employment of naval forces in peace time that have arisen today. This has objectively led to the conclusion of a number of bilateral agreements. Examples are the 1972 Soviet-American agreements on preventing incidents on the high seas and in the airspace above them and the 1989 agreement on preventing dangerous military activity.

So both sides understand the need to regulate the employment of naval forces. To what extent do their interstate documents accord with this?

Not so long ago the world learned of the new Soviet defensive doctrine. All the staff operational directives and combat instructions in force on Soviet warships and the training process at all the naval educational establishments are fully in accordance with its provisions. Every Soviet serviceman, seamen included, knows that we will not be the first to commence hostilities.

That is our side of it, but what about the United States?

Article 0605 of the U.S. Navy regulations, adopted in 1973 and still in force, declares: "A commanding officer must always himself observe and require his subordinates to observe international legal norms." But let us read Article 0915 of the same regulations. Point 1 says that "the right to self-defense can arise only as retaliation to the use of force or the direct threat of its use."

You do not have to be an expert in the law to realize that the final section of this point gives the ship's commanding officer a free hand, allowing him to employ weapons not only in response to a strike, but on his subjective perception of the threat of such a strike.

Point 2 of this same article simplifies still further the right to use weapons: "Conditions requiring the exercise of the right to self-defense cannot be precisely formulated beforehand. The right to define such conditions should be left to the sound judgment of responsible naval personnel who fulfill their duties in this respect with caution and self-possession."

In 1981 the Pentagon adopted rules for the combat employment of navy forces which give American naval commanders recommendations on the employment of weapons in peace time that are no less vague than "sound judgment," "caution," and "self-possession." Under their guidance, in 1983 operation "Urgent Fury" was carried out, whereby U.S. Navy amphibious forces occupied the sovereign island state of Grenada. And in March 1986 Vice Adm. F. Kelso, commander of the American Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, gave commanding officers the order to regard all combat units of the Libyan Armed Forces going outside territorial waters

and the airspace above them as hostile. And strikes were made against Libyan Navy missile boats and Libyan shore radar stations.

However, in the light of these facts Adm. Trost's words are even more alarming: "If deterrence proves insufficient, our actions at the time will be determined by the commanding officers taking the decision at that moment." Incidentally, the admiral concludes his theoretical article with an invitation to debate the subject. He also invited us—the professorial and teaching staff of a naval academy—to take part in an exchange of opinions during a recent visit to the academy.

So by way of an exchange of opinions I would like to say this: Professional naval seamen cannot but realize that provisions whereby the right to take an autonomous decision to employ weapons, complying only with the rather vague "sound judgment," is farmed out to American commanding officers by legislation, are extremely dangerous and do not accord with today's peacetime realities. Where is the guarantee that they will take the decision with "due caution and self-possession"?

Of course, the American side could object, citing as an argument the thesis, widespread in the United States, of the professional competence of their commanding officers. But is this really beyond dispute? Suffice it to recall the "crime of the century," as the world press called the destruction of an Iranian civil airliner by the American cruiser "Vincennes" in the Persian Gulf on 3 July 1988. Hundreds of totally innocent civilian passengers died. That was the result both of the dangerous conduct of the U.S. Navy in international waters and, as the foreign press noted, of the competence of the ship's command personnel, which left something to be desired.

Practice shows that bilateral agreements on the prevention of incidents on the high seas and in the airspace above them and on the prevention of dangerous military activity are now patently insufficient. It is necessary to formulate and adopt a corresponding universal international convention which would lower the level of military confrontation at sea.

Science Academy, U.S. Firm Sign Agreement

*LD1506093290 Moscow TASS in English 0839 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kirilchenko]

[Text] New York June 15 TASS—The Minnesota-based American computer corporation Control Data and the USSR Academy of Sciences have signed a cooperation agreement, spokesmen for Control Data said on Thursday.

The agreement was signed on June 3 when Mikhail Gorbachev was in Minnesota and visited Control Data Headquarters.

The document provides for the joint development of experimental projects to ensure safety at civilian nuclear

facilities, control the production and transfer of electric energy, compile computer programs and develop oil deposits.

Control Data experts will visit the Soviet Union several times to discuss the initial stages of these projects.

Representatives of Control Data, which have been cooperating with Soviet partners for more than 20 years, hope that cooperation with Soviet scientists will help the two countries and the whole world resolve many economic, ecological and social problems.

Control Data Director Jim Osley told TASS on the phone that the conclusion of the cooperation agreement was a very positive step. Five concrete areas of cooperation have been outlined. He said that American experts wanted to get better acquainted with Soviet achievements in computer software and study possibilities for the broad commercial application of computer programs. The Soviet side will have the opportunity to expand knowledge on American achievements in computer technology.

Control Data is planning to deliver six computers to the Soviet Union, which will increase safety at Soviet nuclear power stations. The corporation's representatives are waiting for the final approval of export licences. The computers can then be delivered over the next three or four months.

Osley emphasised that the Bush-Gorbachev summit opened up broad opportunities for such cooperation. The Soviet Union seeks to expand trade with the United States, particularly in technology, and the United States would like to make its contribution to this process. He said he was impressed by Gorbachev's desire to study the experience of companies manufacturing sophisticated equipment. American business and industrial circles regarded it as a sign of broader opportunities on the Soviet market.

China

Alekseyev on China's Nuclear Disarmament Stance

*OW1806224490 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0100 GMT 15 Jun 90*

[By station commentator Alekseyev; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] At the Soviet-Chinese consultations in Beijing, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev briefed Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen on the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

Qian Qichen said: We welcome the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, and the understanding reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit over the reduction of offensive strategic weapons.

Qian Qichen hoped that the Soviet Union and the United States will formulate details of the treaty and put it into effect as soon as possible. Our station commentator Alekseyev writes:

The Soviet-U.S. treaty on reducing offensive strategic weapons probably will be signed this year. This was announced by Soviet President Gorbachev at the USSR Supreme Soviet on 12 June. Based on its principle and disarmament stance, the Chinese Government has considered the treaty very important. The Soviet Union thinks highly of Beijing's resolute position and its proposal for the destruction of all nuclear weapons. China was the first nation to pledge never to use nuclear weapons first. The Soviet Union also has made such a pledge.

After the signing of the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty in 1987, China clearly indicated its view on the reduction of Soviet-U.S. strategic nuclear weapons. At that time, Beijing had expressed the belief that if Moscow and Washington could reduce their offensive strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent, it would be a great breakthrough toward the destruction of all nuclear weapons.

I would like to mention China's attitude on other nuclear powers participating in nuclear disarmament. A recent article in RENMIN RIBAO noted that the Soviet Union and United States should make the first move to greatly reduce their nuclear weapons. After that China and other countries with nuclear weapons will join in nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union understands this position. Now that preparations for the Soviet-U.S. treaty to reduce offensive strategic weapons will soon be underway, the stage for other nations' participation is drawing near. This is a happy event, because it is only possible to destroy all nuclear weapons in the world if every country in possession of nuclear weapons participates in disarmament.

Rear Admiral Khuzokov on China Relations

LD1606153590 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Military ties between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have become regular. This point has been made to a reporter, Sergey Kozlov, by the head of the Soviet military delegation that just returned from China, Rear Admiral Vladimir Khuzhokov.

[Begin Khuzhokov recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] The delegation's head said that they had important talks with the chief of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army of China, Colonel General Chi Hoatian, and deputy head of the Chief Political Board, Lieutenant General Yu Yongbo. There were fruitful talks at the Board of Foreign Relations of China's Defense Ministry. At these talks contacts were agreed on for this year and an accord was reached for promoting military ties next year. Agreement was made to proceed from words to actions.

Another Soviet delegation is already being prepared. The first delegation invited by China is that of Soviet Army veterans who helped with the establishment of the Chinese Armed Forces. And by the way, we have noticed that people in China remembered that assistance and are still of a high opinion about it. We also noticed that the Chinese military share our regret about the 30 lost years, so to say, when there were no contacts between the two armies. It is gratifying that the bad things are in the past and that ahead lie regular friendly links between representatives of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. [end recording]

Predicts 'Friendly Contacts'

OW1706143890 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "World Today" program]

[Text] Read Admiral (Khorokov), who headed a Soviet military delegation to China, gave an interview with our station reporters upon his return from China.

He said: The foundation for regular Soviet-Chinese military contacts has already been laid.

He said: We held important talks with Chi Haotian, chief of general staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, and Lieutenant General Yu Yongbo, deputy director of its General Political Department. We had fruitful talks with the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the Chinese Defense Ministry. The two sides have decided on contacts for this year and reached an agreement on the development of military contacts next year. It is anticipated that these words will be translated into concrete action. We have already organized the next delegation. The first delegation invited by the Chinese side is a delegation of Soviet veteran soldiers who had assisted the construction of Chinese armed forces.

(Khorokov) pointed out: Incidentally China still speaks highly of such assistance and regrets the three decades during which no contact were made between the Soviet and Chinese Armed Forces. It is gratifying to notice that unpleasant feelings are gone. From now on representatives of the Soviet and Chinese armed forces will hold friendly contacts on a regular basis.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev-No Tae-u Summit 'Deal' Denied

LD1806222990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2135 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—"The Soviet Union, having confirmed its position on the Korean problem, is willing to facilitate the development of dialogue between the North and South and the cause of Korea's peaceful unification. This is a path toward reducing tension on the Korean peninsula and strengthening peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific region. It is precisely this

which constitutes the essence of the initiatives put forward in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk."

This statement was made by Yevgeniy Primakov, USSR Presidential Council member and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. During a meeting in PRAVDA's editorial office, an account of which was printed in today's edition of this newspaper, he replied in particular to a question about the meeting between the President of the USSR Mikhail Gorbachev and President of South Korea No Tae-u in San Francisco.

"It would be incorrect," he noted, "to consider the Soviet-Korean summit meeting as some kind of deal along the lines that Moscow is out for political contacts to obtain loans, equipment, and consumer goods for this. As someone who was present at this meeting, I can testify that during it there was no discussion of such accords."

ROK's Sin Hyon-hwak on Soviet Ties, Koreans

SK190602490 Moscow International Service in Korean
1100 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] At the invitation of Guriy Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Mr. Sin Hyon-hwak, honorary chairman of Samsung Group, one of the leading ROK business groups, and former ROK prime minister, came to our country. The following are questions and answers in an interview between our station reporter and Mr. Sin Hyon-hwak.

[Unidentified reporter] Could you tell us about the purpose of your visit and about your meetings with Soviet scholars, business representatives, and political activists?

[Sin] I came to the Soviet Union because President Marchuk of the USSR Academy of Sciences wanted me to explain on the process of development achieved by the ROK, particularly in the economic fields, and because I wanted to listen to the Soviet explanation on the economic situation of the Soviet Union, so as to deepen the understanding between the two sides to explore ways to bring closer economic ties between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

I have met many people. Among them were many personages from the Academy of Sciences, including President Marchuk; Mr. (Shatalin); Director Titarenko of the Far East Institute; Mr. Golanov of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry; and this morning I met with Deputy Premier (Chiskanus) of the Russian Republic [as heard]. I plan to meet many more people. Among them are Mr. Aganbegyan and Mr. Abalkin. Mr. (Tryan) is now away on a business trip, so I am going to meet his deputy.

All these personages I met told me that since the Soviet Union has committed itself to reforms in the direction of market economy, the scholars of various fields and

government people are working together on the best and most reasonable plan for it. And I thought that they will arrive at a good plan if they discuss extensively among these personages of various fields, referring to the examples in foreign countries.

[Reporter] The first meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u was held recently in San Francisco. According to your view, what effect will this meeting have on the development between our two countries?

[Sin] I think that the meeting between the two presidents was a historic event, and that this meeting has opened a way that could lead to a great change in the Far East. Because of this meeting, the cooperative relations between the ROK and the Soviet Union can develop without limit, which will eliminate the instability on the Korean peninsula. It will not only help ease tensions between North and South Korea but will help promote cooperative relations between them. This will ultimately lead to reunification through a long developmental process—reunification by peaceful means. The meeting provided a new historic turning point for all the Far Eastern countries to develop themselves through cooperation with the Soviet Union.

[Reporter] What is the position of the ROK regarding dialogue with the DPRK? What effort do you think will be necessary to resume the dialogue and bring forth specific results from it?

[Sin] Frankly speaking, we have had no results at all to date. The fundamental position of the ROK is that the ROK is not a country of confrontation to North Korea but a fraternal country to it, that the two sides should live (?amicably) together, that the two sides should discuss their problems peacefully through dialogue, that they should cooperate to mutual advantage, that, by so doing, both sides develop together, and that they can achieve reunification in the long run. The firm fundamental position of the ROK is that the two sides should not engage in an arms race, that they should not prepare for war, that they should begin dialogue for peace, and that, by so doing, they should explore ways to mutual help and mutual prosperity.

[Reporter] The (?establishment) of relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK is not mutually related to the settlement of the situation on the Korean peninsula. The positions of our two countries regarding the development of relations are somewhat different. Seoul places priority on the establishment of diplomatic relations, whereas Moscow stresses the development of economic relations in the first place. Moreover, relations of this nature promise mutual advantage for both sides. However, the ROK businessmen are not in a hurry to form working relations with Soviet businessmen. What is your opinion of this?

[Sin] Economic relations can be established between the countries that have no diplomatic relations. And the economic relations can develop to further relations.

Therefore, economic relations have been established between the ROK and the Soviet Union, and they are being developed at a considerable pace. I expect this to continue in the future as well. However, the important point is that despite this the economic relations without diplomatic relations must have limitations. For example, it is impossible, between the countries without diplomatic relations, to undertake a large-scale investment or joint investment, because neither side is sure of success. This is applicable not only to the relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK but also to the relations between any countries in the world. Therefore, we desire an early establishment of diplomatic relations to develop the economic cooperative relations more rapidly and on a larger scale. Despite the limitations which must exist without diplomatic relations, we have been developing our cooperative relations on a considerable scale, and we intend to develop them in the future as well.

Reportage on Visit by Governor of Hokkaido

Meets With Yakovlev

LD1606185490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1315 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jun (TASS)—Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the USSR Presidential Council and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today met Takahiro Yokomichi, the governor of Hokkaido Prefecture (Japan). The state of the prospects for the development of relations in the Asian-South Pacific region were discussed in light of the initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk, and in light of the positive changes taking place both in the world and in the region.

Particular attention was devoted to the place which wide and diverse ties between USSR and Japan could occupy in this complex, including the relations of friendly partnership of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] with the Hokkaido Prefecture.

Meets Council of Ministers

PM1806094390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Guest from Japan"]

[Text] T. Yokomichi, governor of the northern Japanese territory of Hokkaido, arrived in Moscow 14 June at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The guest was accompanied by employees of municipal organs, managers, and journalists.

On the same day there was a conversation between V.M. Vinogradov, RSFSR foreign minister, and T. Yokomichi.

Concrete questions concerning the development of cooperation between the Russian Federation and Hokkaido were discussed during the conversation.

Yokomichi, Titarenko on Northern Islands

OW1806065490 Tokyo KYODO in English 0557 GMT
18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 18 KYODO—A Soviet specialist on East Asian affairs has urged Japan and the Soviet Union to return to the fundamental agreement of their 1956 joint communique to resolve their territorial dispute over islands off northern Japan.

M.A. Titarenko, director of the Soviet Academy of Sciences Institute of the Far East, reportedly told the governor of Hokkaido, Takahiro Yokomichi, in a meeting Saturday that two of the four disputed islands could be handed back to Japan under a phased return after the conclusion of a peace treaty between the two nations.

The Soviet Union refused to sign the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty following World War II, but a Japan-Soviet joint declaration in 1956 formally ended hostilities and led to the establishment of diplomatic relations.

The declaration said Shikotan and the Habomai Islands group, just off the tip of Hokkaido's east coast, would be returned to Japan on the conclusion of a Japan-Soviet peace treaty. Japan has maintained that all four islands, including Kunashiri and Etorofu, must be returned before a treaty can be concluded.

The islands were seized by the Soviet Union at the end of World War II.

Titarenko also indicated that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will call in Tokyo this September prior to President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit next year.

Concerning the possible return of the islands, he hinted that Gorbachev will be measuring Japan's attitude during his upcoming visit. He said the Soviet Union would have to rescind a 1960 declaration scrapping the 1956 agreement and Japan also would have to return to the basic agreement.

Moscow said in 1960 it was withdrawing its 1956 promise to return Shikotan and the Habomai group to Japan because the international security situation changed with the revision in 1960 of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

Titarenko, whose institute is a think tank on Soviet policy in East Asia, urged the promotion of joint development projects to utilize the resources surrounding the islands while calling for measures to build up mutual confidence.

Petrovskiy Meets Japanese Group, Dialogue Urged

PM1806155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks in the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, received T. Suzuki and K. Eto, representatives from the leadership of the Japanese organization "Soka Gakkai International" for a discussion. During the discussion, there was an interested and thorough exchange of opinions on questions of the further activation of Soviet-Japanese dialogue, including extending cooperation at UN level.

Near East & South Asia

Israel's Shamir Rules Out PLO From Talks

LD1806151590 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir said he was "prepared for talks with Palestinians", provided the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) would be excluded from the process and the negotiations would be based on Israeli plans for elections on the occupied territories. "We shall not discuss with Palestinians ways to elaborate a permanent solution. There is no need to meet them if they wish to discuss the creation of a Palestinian state," Shamir said.

Shamir's statement is the first practical embodiment of the tough political course earlier declared by the conservative Israeli cabinet formed by Shamir last week. His partners in the ruling coalition openly advocate the annexation of occupied Arab lands and the settlement of Jewish immigrants there. They stress they would not go further than extending limited autonomy to the occupied West Bank and the Gaza strip within the "greater Israel". At the same time Tel Aviv threatens to "act resolutely" against intifada combatants.

Shamir's new cabinet is even more obstructionist than the previous one. It clearly rules out any dialogue and, consequently, the possibility of peace in the region. Tel Aviv rejects the Palestinians' principal demand for self-determination and a sovereign state on historically Arab lands. It also rejects any contacts with the PLO, which is the only lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine, recognised all over the world. Shamir proposes some sort of a curtailed "Palestinian autonomy" within the boundaries of Israel. This leads not to peace but to still sharper confrontation in the region.

This course's extremism is borne out by the new Israeli Government's plans to kill PLO leaders during actions to stamp out the intifada. These plans were divulged by leader of the Palestinian resistance movement Abu Ayad in an interview with the Qatar newspaper "AL-SHARQ".

Ayat said the Palestinian leadership had "exhaustive information" about these plans, which are planned to be implemented within the next few months. The Israeli authorities' dangerous designs reflect the warlike and terroristic essence of Tel Aviv's strategy and tactics,

elevated to the level of state policy. The present Israeli leadership shouts about "Palestinian terrorism", ascribing terroristic acts even to unarmed children and women, while perpetrating ruthless acts of terror and violence.

Constant military confrontation with Arabs and growing international isolation, into which Shamir's cabinet is driving the country, are hardly in the interests of Tel Aviv. The only realistic way to achieve long-awaited peace in the Middle East is to call an international conference under U.N. aegis. Most countries of the world favour such a meeting.

Economic Minister Katushev Meets Libyan Group

LD1906072990 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT
19 Jun 90

[by TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Anchikov]

[Text] Tripoli June 19 TASS—Talks between Soviet and Libyan delegations ended here on Monday. The delegations were headed by Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev and Secretary of the Libyan General People's Committee for Petroleum Fawzi al-Shakshuki.

The sides reached agreement on Soviet-Libyan cooperation, including the settlement of mutual payments, Katushev told TASS.

The agreements open up good possibilities to develop Soviet-Libyan economic, scientific and technological cooperation that will boost the development of relations between the two countries having mutual aims, Al-Shakshuki said.

During the visit, Katushev was received by Libyan leader Muammar al-Qadhafi. Katushev handed over a message from President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Accords Reached, Talks End

LD1806175790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1710 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Tripoli, 18 Jun—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Anchikov reports:

Talks between the Soviet and Libyan delegations led by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister for foreign economic relations, and Fawzi Shakshuki, secretary for petroleum of the Libyan Jamahiriyyah, ended here today.

The head of the USSR delegation noted in an interview with the TASS correspondent that during the talks accords were reached on questions connected with the development of Soviet-Libyan cooperation, including the question of regularizing the payment obligations of the sides.

Fawzi Shakshuki stressed for his own part that these accords open up great possibilities for expanding Soviet-Libyan ties in economy, science, and technology. They

will provide an additional impetus for the development of relations between the two countries based on joint objectives.

During his stay in Tripoli K.F. Katushev was received by Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, to whom he conveyed a message from M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Afghan Leaders

LD1806164890 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT
18 Jun 90

[Text] Kabul June 18 TASS—Afghan Prime Minister Fazl Haq Khaliqyar today met a visiting delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament).

The Soviet deputies were led by P. Shetko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Veterans of the Afghan War, and V. Ochirov, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defence and State Security Committee.

The Afghan prime minister emphasised that Afghan-Soviet friendship and become well-established. He said that the new Afghan Government would seek to strengthen these relations and that his cabinet would continue efforts to release Soviet soldiers imprisoned by the Afghan opposition.

Khaliqyar pointed out that Soviet economic aid was very important in restoring the war-devastated Afghan economy. "We expect more international aid, especially from neighbouring countries."

The Soviet parliamentarians met with President Najibullah on Sunday. Najibullah briefed them on deep renovation processes in the political and social life of Afghan society.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation left for home today.

Increased Aid for Afghanistan, Trade Urged

PM1506143190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 p 3

[Special correspondents I. Chernyak and S. Kuznetsov report: "When We Pulled Out..."]

[Excerpt] Moscow-Kabul-Bagram-Moscow—[passage omitted] Why were newspapers, radio, and television producing virtually daily reports about the situation in Afghanistan a year ago, while today you hear little apart from the fact that the "rebels have once again bombarded Kabul"?—we asked several times. Reasonable answers followed: There is no demand, the Afghan war is "out of fashion." It was sad to see Aleksandr Shkirando learn on his return from a duty tour to Qandahar that there was no room for his reportage in the evening edition of the "Vremya" program.

Of course, life moves on—there are a host of problems in the union, East Europe is in ferment, contacts with the West are expanding, and the situation is strained in Central America and the Near East. Nonetheless. First: Soviet troops have pulled out, but the war in Afghanistan goes on, a war that was unleashed with our participation. So, we are obliged to help that country return to a peaceful life. If this does not happen, people should know why. Second: Hundreds of Soviet citizens work here. They are working here because their country needs this. Are we going to cover this up once again for the sake of some imaginary secrecy? Third: We are offering Afghanistan tremendous aid. How is it distributed and by whom, and how appropriately? Finally, the last point: Afghanistan is not only our neighbor in the Islamic south, but is also a country with still-untapped potential. Is it not too early to register it as a "diplomatic province," as someone wrote in fun on an embassy office door?

There is a special Aeroflot flight from Moscow to Kabul once a week. A Tu-154 flies as far as Tashkent, from there an Il-76 heads for Kabul fitted with heat-seeking missiles to protect the aircraft against "Stingers." Nevertheless every day Kabul airport receives a host of aircraft: A USSR-Afghanistan "airlift" is in operation. Everything is shipped from the union—from food, fuel, and weapons to containers of freshly minted Afghan banknotes, and even decorations and medals for the government army. What is more, dozens of trucks cross the border at Kushka and Termez every day. H. Hyde and C. Wilson, members of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, claim that USSR economic and military aid to Afghanistan totals in excess of \$300 million a month.

Our Ambassador B.N. Pastukhov considers this figure pretty overstated. While keeping quiet about the size of the military shipments, he told us that USSR free economic aid has today been fixed at R120 million a year (instead of the R500 million of two years ago), but last year for a number of reasons we only offered R80 million in aid. Of this, roughly one-third is made up of food (approximately 280,000 tonnes of wheat, 100,000 tonnes of sugar, rice, tea, grain, flour, and so on), one-third of kerosene, gasoline, and diesel fuel, and one third of cement, glass, equipment, and automobiles. Ten aircraft whose crews risk being downed by "Stingers" in midair or perishing from rocket projectiles on the ground carry all this to Kabul every day. And generally return empty.

"There are nine members of our crew, and we get \$200 each per flight plus wages of R1,500. We have a six-month contract," one pilot said. "I worked previously in Tashkent; I couldn't have dreamed of such a 'windfall.' There is clearly a long waiting list for this job. Only you sometimes get to thinking: Perhaps, we're doing something wrong if we burn as much kerosene alone per flight as we are taking there. And I have heard that hens are fed our wheat, and a great deal is embezzled or sent off to Pakistan."

[Excerpt] ...According to Western reports, the number of Soviet military advisers in Afghanistan fluctuates in the region of 300-500.

"Rubbish," the leader of a group of our military specialists in Afghanistan—an army general who asked not to be named—replied to this. "There are 20-25 of us here, including five generals, plus specialists on duty tours engaged in repairing aircraft, radio stations, etc. We wear civvies. We're not called advisers now, but specialists. The difference being that an adviser gives advice and watches to see that this advice is carried out, while a specialist only hands over military hardware and weapons and helps people learn how to handle them."

Be that as it may, we supply Afghanistan with weapons, munitions, aircraft, and hundreds of tanks and combat vehicles, along with "Scud" operational-technical missiles and "Luna" and "Uragan" missile systems, which far exceed the enemy's missiles in terms of yield and are mass-destruction weapons. Despite the Afghan Government's national reconciliation policy, there are plans to build vast munitions dumps in Hayraton alongside the Soviet-Afghan border. Soviet troops have pulled out of Afghanistan, our guys are no longer dying there, but does this mean that we have abandoned the war?

The main question is the following: What are we to do next? Are we to grit our teeth and continue to help, attributing this to international duty, or should we "shut off the faucet," denying the Afghans all the things that we have hitherto lavished on them with such extreme generosity?

We shoulder the tremendous burden of economic aid to Afghanistan—aid which does not, moreover, ensure independent development, but which is simply "edible" aid. We are providing this aid at a time when there is no abundance to be seen in our own country. A considerable proportion of our economic deliveries fail to reach their destination owing to corruption and muddled distribution. Sharp operators on both sides of the border "feather their own nests" from this. Obviously, new approaches are needed, based on considerations of expediency founded on economic laws and on our interests instead of abstract slogans of justice.

As for military aid.... The aim of our policy in Afghanistan should have been not only to withdraw our troops but also to establish peace there and create conditions for a political rather than an armed struggle. What is needed is a sincere desire to really stop interfering in another country's affairs, otherwise we are only changing our political methods, renouncing direct troop involvement. Clearly, there will only be peace when the superpowers stop thinking about their influence in Afghanistan and end the "fight to make deliveries"....

Because of the war, Afghanistan is in a disastrous economic situation and cannot meet the basic needs of its population or ensure its citizens' subsistence. By supplying arms, we are not only still further inciting Najibullah's government to participate in the conflict and to

fight a war against a section of its own people in which some Afghans are massacring others, but we are also aggravating the situation in the economy, which is already in ruins. Perhaps, if we are unable to put a stop to the war, we should not nurture it, but stop our arms shipments—that would be in line with the norms of general human morality....

"Why do I disagree?" the leader of the group of military specialists fell to thinking. "First, there can be no question of our interfering in Afghanistan's affairs. We are providing aid, guided by our moral obligations and on the basis of mutual agreements. We are not only backing Najibullah's government because it is a friendly government, although this is of no small importance. Remember: Opposition leaders Hikmatyar, Mojaddedi, and Sayyaf began the armed struggle prior to the April Revolution. They did not like the king, the bourgeois republic, or the current situation. They crave power. But it is well known that it is easier to take power than to keep hold of it. If the opposition are unable to find a common language among themselves today, what will happen when they enter Kabul? The civil war will be even fiercer, hundreds of thousands of people will be butchered, discrimination against women will begin, and those rudiments of democracy that exist today will be ruthlessly suppressed.

"Moreover, what does it mean for the USSR to have an unfriendly state as its southern neighbor? After all, Hikmatyar does not hide the fact that he aims to set up an Islamic republic that includes our Central Asian republics as well," the army general continued. "Islamic disturbances are taking place today in India, Pakistan, and China. I do not want 'coffins' to fly out of Tashkent and Dushanbe tomorrow. I am not talking about drug smuggling, which the incumbent government is somehow combating today. Otherwise the cost of maintaining the Soviet-Afghan border—2284 km—will rise many times. A reasonable approach is needed: We may talk of curtailing aid to Nicaragua, Angola, and Ethiopia, whose debts are incomparably greater and which are far-removed from us, but Afghanistan is close at hand and could become a time bomb.

"Here is another element. At the International Court in The Hague we signed an agreement whereby, if Afghanistan renders its account, the USSR will be obliged to pay compensation for the damage sustained in the course of combat operations. This is not a matter of millions but of tens of billions of dollars. The friendly government is not raising this question. Why should we be interested in its withdrawing from the scene?

"That is why we are also offering Afghanistan aid, including military aid—which is, incidentally, lower today by a factor of 2.5 than a few years ago. Equipment does not generally come here off the conveyer belt: Soviet taxpayers have already paid for it. We give them tanks that would have been scrapped—moreover, scrapping them would have cost more than delivering them here. We bring in missiles that are to be destroyed. The

MiG-21, Su-17, and Su-22M aircraft have already outlived their service life by more than half. The last 'Scud's' are being manufactured, and there will be no more shipments of 'Uragan' and 'Luna' despite the Afghans' request—that is our government's decision. But the main thing is that we are prepared to stop supplying any weapons if the other side does the same."

Another prestigious opinion. "I often think this: The bread combine, the Jangalak plant, and the house-building combine were all built before the April Revolution. Then we just spent 11 years destroying them. We only destroyed things. And they still love us after that. They're an amazing people," the ambassador told us. "I am saying this because we have to change."

In Gorno-Badakhshan Oblast, which borders Afghanistan, the meat combines are 40-percent occupied: There is no meat. Over the river here, people don't know what to do with the sheep—people in Peshawar do not take them because they have enough of their own. Nor do people in the USSR: Are they contaminated?

...Two plants in Tajikistan processing medicinal herbs are on the brink of shutting down: There are no raw materials. Herbs grow in abundance in this area. But there is no one to go and conclude an agreement.

...The USSR Ministry of the Medical Industry buys opium from India for hard currency. The Afghans, who do not need it, confiscate and burn it. Our people restrained them, saying: Give it to us! Some 46 tonnes have already been collected. Moscow receives telephone calls and letters virtually every day: Take this, virtually for free. In return a certificate is required saying that it corresponds with standards and that international organizations are not opposed to this. And dollars are still being wasted in India....

Our trade mission in Afghanistan can tell a considerable number of stories like that. People are indignant.

Meanwhile aircraft return home empty.

"The ministries' economic egoism and lack of interest, and the ungovernability of our economy are to blame for everything," Ambassador B.N. Pastukhov reckons. "We cannot see further than our own noses. Look, who is dying to get into Afghanistan today more than anyone else? The Japanese. They want to organize an artel here to produce copper, to break the U.S., Chilean, and RSA monopoly. The mountains of Afghanistan contain elements that radio electronics cannot do without, there are very rich gas deposits, there is oil, and mineral deposits. Under our agreement with the government we can extract all this in return for our deliveries. But how inefficient we are! We previously exported 200 tonnes of raisins, now we export 40 tonnes. Why? I am the ambassador; I can't tell you. On the other hand they're sold on the union markets at exorbitant prices. Pomegranates are one of the three miraculous substances that nature has created to treat radiation sicknesses—Well, don't the children of Chernobyl need them? What about

nuts, rugs, leather, and wool? Please! Merchants are ready to pay in dollars when trading with us. We are too lazy to take them, hence the aircraft come back empty. The problem lies in how to organize mutually beneficial cooperation and not in how to 'cut back' our aid.

"Certainly, we are helping Afghanistan with weapons. We are forcing ourselves to do this, with a moral tremor. We are helping to ensure that things do not get worse here. We are providing food aid. To stop would be the same as to deny a beggar alms. Let us recall the famine in the Volga area when Afghanistan gave the USSR tens of thousands of poods of grain. So, 280,000 tonnes of wheat after that—is that a great deal if we are losing 300,000 tonnes annually on the USSR's railroads. What is R120 million in economic aid? It is chicken feed for a state. If the question arises, I will go to Moscow and hold one-on-one talks with every member of the Supreme Soviet, I will go to the leaders of the interregional group and make my entreaties, but we must rake in these millions for Afghanistan."

... "We Are Pulling Out"—that was the title of the song written by Officer Igor Morozov to mark our troops' withdrawal from Afghanistan. The troops have pulled out. But following their withdrawal we must not push aside and wipe this unusual, proud country from our memories.

That is not a humane thing to do.

Afghanistan Since Soviet Pullout Viewed

Part I

PM1306085090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 pp 3-4

[First part of special correspondent I. Chernyak reportage on Afghan scene one year after Soviet troops' departure: "When We Left..."]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] "And how are things there now?"—On our return we heard this question many times. In the opinion of everyone in Afghanistan, in general things are calmer. Although it is all relative. Judge for yourselves. Active hostilities have ceased over the greater part of the country. The roads are open. Since the withdrawal of the troops tens of thousands of mujahidin have come over to the side of the government, and temporary cease-fire agreements have been concluded with many of them. In Kabul there have been virtually no terrorist acts recently: They say the "khad" [as transliterated] men (the state security service) are doing an efficient job. In Qandahar, where Soviet soldiers used only to drive along certain streets, and that at extremely high speed, our ambassador Boris Nikolayevich Pastukhov and journalists called quite freely at the stalls and had dealings with Afghans. And there were no escorting armored carriers, only light cars, as in the good old seventies....

That is one side of the coin. On the other hand, the fighting continues unabated near Jalalabad and in Paghman, which is as far from Kabul as Peredelkino [in Moscow Oblast] is from Moscow. Kalat [as transliterated] is under siege. Defensive positions are still being held in Khowst, and even Afghan pilots, for all their bravado, sometimes refuse to fly there—the risk is excessive. Shellings have become markedly more frequent: Whereas in 1988, before the withdrawal of the troops, 635 rocket shells were fired at Kabul, in 1989, after the withdrawal, the figure was 2,200. This year it will obviously be higher. In May a shell exploded on the territory of the now empty U.S. Embassy, the house of the chief physician at the UN clinic was destroyed, a Yugoslav diplomat and a UN representative were wounded, a French doctor was killed in Badakhshan....

"Today I was driving through Kabul, when suddenly I noticed some kind of object in the middle of the road about 100 meters ahead," journalist Vladimir Pasko told me. "I mechanically started trying to estimate whether it would pass between the wheels. As I got closer and saw that it was surrounded by spikes, I realized it was an unexploded rocket. And the interesting thing is: No one was taking any notice, the traffic was normal.... There are still armored carriers and armed soldiers in the streets. At night there is shooting, and you cannot tell who is shooting at whom."

The war goes on. An unusual kind of war, in many ways hard for us to understand. Qandahar again. Friday, a day off. A unit of "irreconcilables" is setting off for the city. Some are going to the "idgah" for Friday prayers, others to meet with friends. They leave their submachineguns and "Blowpipes" at the entrance to the city, as if at the factory gate or in the cloakroom. They say their prayers and socialize, and then, picking up their weapons, return to the mountains to start shooting again. Who could have imagined such a war? Or the "trade" we were told about in Bagram: After the government announced that it would buy "Stingers," people appeared and started buying them from the mujahidin to sell to Kabul. It suits the government better to pay up than to lose an aircraft, and the middle man does well out of it....

For many people here the war is a means of existence. But we were interested in the opinion of N.Kh. Ulumi, governor of Qandahar, a man who has very close contacts with the mujahidin: "The basis of the opposition consists of a cynically pragmatic generation that has been fighting for 11 years, since adolescence. This generation did not study at lay schools and was not raised in the religious spirit or in tribal traditions. It ignores both Muslim etiquette and normal relations between people. These are people without principles; as a rule they have broken with their families, are unwilling to engage in any kind of useful labor, and have devoted themselves in the ugliest manner to the quest for money. They are mercenaries; the Pakistanis, Arabs, and the 'Seven' pay them money, and they will shoot anyone you like. We do not yet know how to deal with this generation, and it will continue to give us considerable problems in future."

Ulumi also asserts that many of the mujahidin do not want to condemn themselves to poverty in the event that the war ends. "Some field commanders have appealed to me, agreeing to stop hostilities if the state gives them help to support their families," he said. "But the Qandahar authorities do not have the resources."

Will they stop shooting if Zahir Shah comes to power, or Hekmatyar, or even the Most High? It is doubtful, in our view.

The second question we were asked most often on our return home was: "What do they feel about us?" We ourselves asked this question in Kabul—we asked our own people and Afghans. The majority think that on the troops' departure the attitude toward the "shuravi" improved. But there are other opinions. One answer is: "How would you feel about people who annihilated hundreds of thousands of your country's inhabitants?" No doubt we would feel strongly. But it is true that sometimes in the streets you meet a look in which there is enough hatred to freeze you to the marrow. The security service still does not advise Soviet people to visit a number of districts of the city, to walk alone, or to leave their cars unattended. And the monument in the Bala Hesar fortress to our guys who died in this land was until recently terribly neglected (perhaps because in the East it is not customary to erect monuments in general), and only the intervention of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA journalist Aleksandr Oleynik led to its being put in good order in time for 9 May....

At the same time there are a great many sincere smiles and kind words. We returned from Bagram to Kabul in an overfull Mi-8 which was shaking with the excess weight (instead of the usual 10 people, some 40 Afghans were packed in). It felt as if it would not take much more for the machine to give way and come crashing down, but the Afghan pilots circled for an extra half-hour solely in order to show the city to a Soviet photographer. Or take this fact: The number of people wanting to learn Russian at the Institute of Soviet Science and Culture has increased many times over. "And whereas formerly they were 'organized,' now they come of their own accord," institute director Vladimir Polozkov told us. "I have been in Afghanistan eight years, and I cannot understand what the problem is."

..."It is a pity that you are not here for long, it is an interesting time for us," many people said to us, referring to the political situation. Important decisions are being adopted one after another. At the end of April the state of emergency was lifted in Kabul, having been imposed on the third day after the Soviet troops' withdrawal. Now all citizens of Afghanistan can go abroad, they are guaranteed privacy of correspondence and telephone conversations and inviolability in their place of residence, and demonstrations and strikes are permitted. Certain other restrictions have also been lifted. The functions of the National Council have been given back to it, from the government. And although the West was skeptical about the lifting of the state of emergency,

believing that it would not have any perceptible effect on the situation in the country, due credit must be given to the Najibullah government, which took a certain risk by giving preference to the people's interests over the interests of the state.

One of the trickiest questions for Afghanistan is that of refugees. There are about 3 million of them in Pakistan today—nearly one-third of all the refugees in the world. Only a trickle is returning home as yet. Many people do not want to go back to the war, and they are afraid of the tyranny of the mujahidin and the air and rocket strikes by government troops against territories controlled by the opposition. Moreover there is often simply nowhere to return to. Najibullah recently issued a decree: All private real estate—houses, factories, land, money—whatever was expropriated by the state after the revolution, is being restored to the owners. This was another attempt to bring fellow citizens back. But many questions still remain, in particular, what is to be done about those whose villages and homes were destroyed, who saw everything that bound them to their native land devastated?

At the end of May Afghanistan's new nonparty prime minister, Fazl Haq Khaleqyar, who was wounded in Herat in spring and at the moment makes his appearances in parliament half-reclining on a litter, formed a new coalition government. Only 12 of the 36 ministers are PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] members. The government includes two women, which is quite unusual. There are 17 ministers who have studied in the West in the past, two in Egypt, and one in Turkey. The new "team" can hardly be accused of being "pro-Soviet," but will this government be able to win the people's confidence? After all, the key posts—the ministers of defense, internal affairs, state security, information, and others—remain with the PDPA, which is afraid of any "surprises" in the present unstable situation. After all, the cost of such "surprises" is tens of thousands of lives.

... "One villager came to Qonduz from the province on a donkey, and went to see the local authorities for some reason or other. They promptly confiscated the donkey, promising to give it back later, with some money into the bargain. In return he had to go to Kabul, to the Loya Jirga, as a deputy from the province. They gave him until the morning to think it over. In the morning the 'delegate' had disappeared, scorning both the money and the hostage donkey, which will now have a new master." We were told this story by one of the workers at the Democratic Youth Organization of Afghanistan Central Committee, who was telling us about the excesses in the localities.

The elections to the Loya Jirga, as the Afghan leadership has stressed repeatedly, were nationwide, and many people who are respected in the country assembled. A new constitution was adopted to replace the old, 1987 one. From now on the PDPA is not the leading force in Afghan society. The paramountcy of the state sector

(which accounted for only 18 percent) over the private sector is no longer stated. The setting up of private schools, hospitals, and banks is permitted by law. The article directed against espionage which existed in Daoud's time has been "restored" to the constitution: Government members and people holding high state posts, top military officials, judges, and certain other officials must not have foreign spouses....

Representatives of the opposition, despite being invited, did not participate in the Loya Jirga and did not join the coalition government. And that means that the guns will go on thundering and the shells exploding. What is the solution? The most realistic option, in our view, is elections. Direct, general, democratic, monitored by the United Nations, the Organization of Islamic States, and the nonaligned movement. But until recently the interested parties—the USSR and the United States—were unable to reach agreement. The USSR was insisting that Najibullah should be in any future government of Afghanistan, while the Americans demanded that he resign even before the elections. Now a compromise has been reached. But how can the opposition leaders who continue to insist on Najibullah's immediate and unconditional departure be persuaded? This question remains open. [passage omitted]

Part II

PM1406100190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 p 3

[Second part of "our special correspondent" I. Chernykh reportage on Afghan scene one year after Soviet troops' departure: "When We Left..."]

[Excerpt] ...Muhammad Ebrahim's predecessor—former Democratic Youth Organization of Afghanistan leader Farid Mazdak—is now a secretary of the PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] Central Committee. He is 32 years old, the youngest person in the Politburo and Secretariat of the PDPA Central Committee. Many of those with whom he sits at the same table are older than his parents. But the Afghans accompanying us stressed several times that "today Comrade Farid is the second man in the party." It was strange to hear this said of a boy with whom we had met several times, about someone who remained in our memory as "the first Afghan young communist."

It is not easy to reach him now. Despite a prior agreement we sat for a long time in the permits office watching soldiers search from head to toe all those who entered the PDPA Central Committee. At the same time numerous telephone calls were made to reach an agreement about us. And finally there came the "OK" to enter and a few minutes later we were in the Central Committee secretary's spacious office.

"The party is now preparing for its congress—the second in its 25 years of existence," Comrade Farid says, fingering some prayer beads. "At it we shall adopt a new program and Statute. The PDPA has been a party of

socialist orientation, it will no longer be that. The main aim is progress and development, the restoration of Afghanistan's economy and culture together with national and Islamic foundations, which is reflected in the program. In the draft Statute the 70 duties which the PDPA member used to have have been reduced to a single paragraph. We have noted that a party member must live according to the laws of the shari'at. We are abandoning recommendations—in any village we have people who for money would even recommend Hekmatyar for the PDPA. Participation in meetings will probably become optional and they will be held when necessary. Recognizing the Statute is not compulsory either since about 70 percent of PDPA members do not read it anyway. It is enough for them to know that this is a party of peace and a Muslim party."

In a recent interview with the Kuwait newspaper AL-AHRAM, Najibullah presented the PDPA as a new Islamic party. DEUTSCHE WELLE waxed ironic on this subject: "There is a new look to the very approach whereby to create a new party people take one that already exists and say that it should be Islamized." But it seems as though the Europeans' ridicule does not particularly perturb the PDPA leaders. Their next step is "reliance on noncommunist foundations and the renunciation of the semicomunist party structure."

"Our party's structure today copies the structure of the CPSU and the parties of the other socialist countries. It seems to us that the structure of the progressive parties of India, Pakistan, and other Eastern countries is more suitable for Afghanistan," Farid Mazdak believes.

[Chernyak] In talks with ordinary Afghans we have frequently heard them express dissatisfaction with the privileged position of the PDPA leaders. They live trouble-free lives. Their children study in the USSR and do not fight at Khowst or Jalalabad, and meanwhile you speak of democracy. Let us recall the Western newspaper reports about how FRG Foreign Minister Genscher was fined for parking his automobile illegally. Could something similar happen in Afghanistan?

[Mazdak] The PDPA leaders includes thieves and bribe takers and there were plenty of abuses. The people are right. So far we lack the determination to deal with these people. But you must bear in mind that in the East leaders traditionally enjoy great privileges. As was once the case with Zahir Shah so today Najibullah has the right not only to park where he wants but also to enter any house.

[Chernyak] In a talk with me a Kabul merchant said that 12 years ago the PDPA promised the people happiness and brought war, a rise in prices, destruction, and death. And if it cannot change the situation today it should surrender power. Is he right in your view?

[Mazdak] The former party leadership committed many errors and failed to fulfill much of what it had promised the people. There are reasons, the main one being that throughout these years we have been hampered by the

war, hampered by the United States and Pakistan, which are helping the opposition wage this war. But the Afghan people know that the PDPA is doing everything possible to establish peace. Today we are not promising the people anything except that we will make every effort to end the armed confrontation. That is our main task.

But, Comrade Farid ended with a sad smile, the changes in strategy and tactics and the elimination of leftist exaggerations, are so far proceeding far more easily in the Democratic Youth Organization of Afghanistan. Our leadership consists mainly of the older generation, which finds it difficult to take radical steps.... [passage omitted]

Sub-Saharan Africa

Committee Cables ANC on Soweto Anniversary

LD1606104890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0520 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jun (TASS)—The Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Afro-Asian Countries sent a telegram to the ANC [African National Congress] in connection with the anniversary of the Soweto uprising celebrated today.

The action of young people 14 years ago showed the whole world that repressions can not stop the desire of the oppressed black majority in South Africa for freedom and democracy, the telegram says. The current success of the national democratic struggle is a direct consequence of the challenge thrown by the young people to the system of apartheid 14 years ago.

The telegram confirms solidarity with the international public in its resolve to retain pressure upon Pretoria until apartheid is fully dismantled.

More on Solidarity With ANC

MB1706101090 Moscow in English to Southern Africa
1900 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] The 16th of June marks the day of solidarity with the struggling people of South Africa. It is observed annually to commemorate the victims of the Soweto events, a tragic milestone in the life of the South African people. Here is our commentary:

On 16 June 1976, the South African police shot at a peaceful demonstration of African school students in Soweto, the largest township of Johannesburg. It was a barbarous crime even for South Africa, replete with repressions.

What were more than 600 teenagers murdered and more other wounded and crippled for? Here is the ANC activist, (Bahava Pava): I was eyewitness to the tragic events, as I took part in the demonstration. We staged peaceful actions for abolishing the discriminatory educational system for the Bantu people and in part against teaching in Afrikaans. I reiterate: Those were peaceful demonstrations.

But it was not by accident that the United Nations proclaimed apartheid a crime against humanity. The authorities were shooting at unarmed children. The Soweto oppressions were one of the most tragic pages in the history of the South African people. Although that could have been hardly so [words indistinct] even a year ago since the tragedy of the Soweto's scale might be repeated any time. Under the state of emergency, the Pieter Botha government led the country to racial confrontation.

Much is different in today's situation in South Africa. The new president, Frederik de Klerk, embarked upon the road of democratic change in the country. The emergency state has been partially lifted, political prisoners are getting freedom, health care and education are being desegregated. But what's more important, political settlement is gaining momentum.

But the matter of democratization also has its (?under-side). It has highlighted and sharpened the relations between the proponents and opponents of apartheid. The creation of the new paramilitary neo-fascist Boere Resistance Movement has been announced in South Africa.

The ultraright whites have stated their readiness to fight with arms in hand for the creation of Boer state after President de Klerk called on South African parties and organizations, both rightwing and leftwing, to renounce violence and state their adherence to [words indistinct] South Africa's future at the negotiating table. If the call remains unheeded, new Sowetos will remain a possibility even in the present day South Africa.

Commentary on South Africa's Economic Problems

MB1706143690 Moscow in English to Southern Africa
1900 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Oleg Sholotin] commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Lately the political reforms of the South African Government have been discussed in the country and outside it. (Oleg Sholotin) comments on some economic problems of South Africa.

Nationalization: This word pronounced by Nelson Mandela after his release brought a negative reaction in South African business circles. They felt that political changes in South Africa could jeopardize their economic inviolability.

Director General of the Mining Chamber of South Africa Johan Liebenberg thinks it's easier to change the Constitution than the economic course. This statement gives ground for thoughts that the white community would only transfer power to the black majority as long as the economy remains in its hands.

On the other hand, many ANC [African National Congress] representatives underscore that nationalization is the only way to overcome poverty in which black South Africans live. It's true there are other voices heard in the

ranks of the ANC who believe the call for the nationalization of property is a hasty step.

Nevertheless, the crying injustice in the distribution of wealth, dating back to time immemorial, is to be uprooted. The Afrikaners seem to have begun to realize that, but in their own way. (?Perceiving) they are losing the power, they seek to save at least part of their property and thus (?stake) on privatization.

But no matter how hard the authorities try to prove that the money gained from the sale of property would go to raise the living standards of those badly off, these measures are not (?profiting) the black community. It seems privatization is premature for Africans since they do not (?possess) means required for attaining government property.

For the last three years they have been acting vigorously only to create small semihomeland enterprises which certainly are not very profitable. Will such enterprises be able to find their place where there exist such industrial giants as Anglo-American and Barlow Rand?

No less problematic for black Africans is the problem of a catastrophic shortage of educated, competent specialists among them, and most probably much time must pass before they will be able to occupy corresponding official posts. Many South Africa economists, who naturally realize that all cannot be done in one day, advise Nelson Mandela not to hurry and to calm down most impatient supporters of nationalization in the African National Congress.

As we see, there are no less economic contradictions between the white minority and the black majority, as well as inside both camps, than there are political ones.

Yet all these contradictions cannot be solved without compromises and, what's of special significance, without eliminating apartheid. This, and only this, is a break for South African economy, it's foreign trade in particular. [sentence as heard]

Apartheid alone is responsible for the country's foreign indebtedness, surpassing \$21 billion. It is responsible for the outflow of foreign investments from the country, and finally apartheid is to blame that the world economic sanctions were introduced against South Africa.

As a result, during four decades, the average [word indistinct] growth rate did not exceed 1.5 percent, while the required figure is at least 5 to 6 percent.

Where to find the money for pressing but expensive problems? Some speak (?of) nationalization, others (?of) privatization. Yet there are such people who speak on the [word indistinct] aid of the world community in case the political life is normalized and sanctions abolished.

Anyway, the gap between the wealthy and the poor should be reduced. It's (?problematic) that the political

reforms will exist alone. Economic changes, being a logical continuation of political reform under way in South Africa, are necessary.

Sanctions on S. Africa Cause 'Economic Hardship'

MB1306141990 Johannesburg SOWETAN in English
13 Jun 90 p 6

[Unattributed "Focus" column; first paragraph is SOWETAN introduction]

[Text] The senior African specialist in the Soviet foreign ministry has conceded that the Soviet Union suffers "considerable" economic hardship from its refusal to do business with South Africa. But he has intimated that Moscow attaches greater importance to the moral aspect of opposing apartheid. Moscow believes it is still too early to say reform in South Africa has become irreversible but once it's possible to lift sanctions, the Soviet Union is ready for "all kinds of mutually beneficial cooperation" with a non-racist South Africa. These and other points were made by Yuri Yukalov, head of the African department of the Soviet foreign ministry, in an interview with Vladimir Astafyev of the Novosti [APN] news agency. This is a shortened account of the interview, prepared by the Sowetan Africa News Service.

Q: How, in your opinion does perestroika and the new political thinking affect the situation in Africa? What is the USSR's present attitude to Africa?

A: The perestroika drive has led to such striking changes in the world situation, to a change from confrontation and ideological rivalry to mutual understanding and co-operation.

The approaches to settling problems of long standing are changing as is evidenced by the resolution of the conflict in South-West Africa. It is believed now that a political solution can and must be found for the domestic conflicts in Angola and Mozambique as well as for the problem of eliminating the apartheid system in South Africa. The less ideological prejudice that is displayed in the approaches to these problems, the easier it will be to settle them.

There are different attitudes to perestroika. Some people (in Africa) are cautious and doubtful as to whether we are doing everything right in our country, but the main thing is the wish that the main aim of this policy—renewal of socialism—should come true. I do not think we have lost any of our friends in Africa because of the de-ideologisation of our inter-state relations. On the contrary, there are considerably more of them now.

I can confirm that this (democratisation of political life in African countries) was the subject of a vivid and interest exchange of opinions during (foreign minister) Eduard Shevardnadze's talks with the leaders of African countries. The general conclusion is that democratisation of state structures and socio-political life is the dominating idea of our time.

Q: Has the concept of what is known as socialist-orientation justified itself in Africa? What have the peoples of the countries that have taken that course gained from it?

A: I could ask the opposite questions: has the concept of capitalist development and free market economy justified itself in practice? I don't think there is one answer to that question either.

The Soviet Union's push to industrialisation has always been a good example for the Africans. What's bad is that along with our experience, our deformed ideas of socialism were automatically transferred to Africa together with our experience, in defiance of common sense and without consideration for the different conditions.

Until now neither the 'socialist' nor the 'capitalist' road of development has helped the African countries in their economic and social development.

Q: Has the Soviet Union stopped supporting the policy of force and pressure which its allies use in Africa, particularly in South Africa, Ethiopia and Angola? Has the Soviet Union given up ill-advised sales of weapons?

A: Defence sufficiency is becoming our basic principle. We cannot ignore the fact that armed resistance from the outside is increasing, though the conflicts in Angola and Ethiopia are internal by nature. It would not be wise in view of this situation to stop all our assistance to the legitimate governments because this could lead the opposition to believe in the possibility of a military victory.

The question of arms supplies to the hotbeds of tension should be decided on a comprehensive basis, so that none of the sides has unilateral advantages.

Q: While welcoming in principle the Government's programme of changes in South Africa, why does the USSR silently agree to the ANC tactics of continued armed struggle to oust the Government? Does it not contradict the proclaimed policy of solving conflicts by political means only?

A: The ANC is a powerful anti-apartheid organisation and it is not in Moscow where its tactics and strategies are worked out. Of course thousands of miles away from South Africa, one can sit in one's office and speculate on the allegedly outdated ANC tactics of armed struggle.

But the ANC leadership has a different opinion—that the system of apartheid in South Africa is the main source of violence and that the opponents of apartheid have every right to respond with violence to violence as long as this system exists.

As for the Soviet position, we believe that favourable conditions have been created to dismantle apartheid by political means.

Which does not mean that negotiations are going to be easy and quick. Nevertheless the very fact of their start is important, the first step has been made and the psychological deadlock is broken.

Q: Is it not against the Soviet interests, particularly economic, to refuse to establish economic and diplomatic relations with South Africa? Why is the Soviet Union against business contacts with South Africa? Do you expect any changes in this respect?

A: Of course we suffer considerable economic losses in refusing to do business with South Africa. But one should ask oneself: can one seek advantage by all means and overlook universal moral values in foreign policy?

The situation in South Africa remains complicated. It is too early to say that progress has gone so far that there can be no return to the past. This is why there is a fairly strong consensus in the world community that it would be too early to lift sanctions. And the UN General Assembly arrived at the same conclusion during its special session on apartheid last December.

As for possible changes in the Soviet position we have indicated that we are prepared to develop all kinds of mutually beneficial cooperation with a democratic and non-racist South Africa. We are hopeful that this will become a real possibility in the near future and we are willing to promote this process.

East Europe

First Stage of Troop Withdrawal From CSFR Ends

LD1506201790 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy]

[Text] Prague June 15 TASS—The first stage of Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia, conducted strictly according to the agreed schedule, is over.

There were no difficulties and some target figures, contained in the signed documents, have been surpassed, Czechoslovak Deputy Defence Minister Lieutenant-General Rudolf Duhacek and Central Army Group Commander Colonel-General E. Vorobyev believe.

A total of 26,000 soldiers and officers, 550 tanks, 859 armored personnel carriers and other equipment have left Czechoslovakia. Vorobyev stressed that combat units will be pulled out from Czechoslovakia by February 26, 1991, the date not determined by the intergovernmental agreement.

The second stage, when 25,000 Soviet servicemen and military equipment are expected to leave Czechoslovakia, is to end by December 31, 1990.

Complete Withdrawal Expected by Feb

AU1506145990 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 1445 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet Union will withdraw its troops stationed in the CSFR by end of February next year at the latest.

This was confirmed by the commander in chief, Colonel General Eduard Vorobyev, who is responsible for the withdrawal of the troops, at an international news conference in Prague today. Maintenance personnel will remain in the CSFR until the end of June.

The new Soviet ambassador to Prague, Boris Pankin, has meanwhile expressed "deepest regret" over the invasion of the Warsaw Pact troops in 1968.

Economic Problems Beset New CSFR Government

LD1706125190 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Now we have a commentary by our observer Valentin Aleksandrov in connection with the coming formation of a new government in Czechoslovakia. [passage omitted]

Most of the people are opposed to government by one party, which they see as a one-party monopoly on power, or by a narrow coalition, and this will evidently have to be taken into account in the process of forming the new government. For the time being the Czechoslovak people are still riding high to some extent on the euphoria following the events of autumn 1989 and the victory of Civic Forum and Public Against Violence in the elections, and by and large, they are oblivious to the difficulties which lie in store.

Many take a sort of devil-may-care attitude to the price rises which will be unavoidable in the transition to a market economy, believing that the state will fully cushion their impact. This same problem is also being faced by the Soviet Union, so this is something that we, along with you listeners, will have to go through together, and chanting slogans at meetings and laying the blame for all the problems on the communists will not help in this respect.

Today we can say frankly that the present government's hopes for Western credits and the construction of new enterprises with Western finance have, in effect, fallen flat. Contradictory statements by certain officials, and surprise revelations and their subsequent recantations only complicate the situation. Let us recall here that only recently, Vaclav Klaus stated on television that within about three months the country would set an advantageous exchange rate for the Czechoslovak crown against the other CEMA currencies. That is just one example of the work of the current government, and to that we could add the somewhat disingenuous explanations to the public of the problems of raw material and energy

supplies from the Soviet Union, and the sale of Czechoslovak goods in the USSR. This creates the impression that certain people are building their policy on the fact that Czechoslovakia will not, as they allege, be dependent on the Soviet Union at all—all right, they say, if the Soviet Union will not supply the oil, we don't care, we will build an oil pipeline via the Adriatic. What they are forgetting, however, is that they must first get permission to build the pipeline, and then it will cost many billions of crowns to build.

However, let us not get bogged down in financial and legal details. Czechoslovakia is a sovereign country and therefore it can make whatever decisions it considers necessary. But what if all its other CEMA partners do the same? Incidentally, in its trade with the CEMA countries, the Soviet Union makes a loss of about \$8 to \$10 billion per annum. The Soviet Union is also a sovereign country, but it does not back-pedal on longstanding and often disadvantageous agreements.

The government's economic program is not to the liking of many people in Czechoslovakia, including the trade unions, because it is the people who will have to bear the brunt. Radical economic reform in the Soviet Union is also making life difficult for the people to some extent. This unhappy prospect is something we will have to learn to live with.

Let me wind up by wishing the governments of our countries all the best in jointly and speedily implementing economic reform and switching to a market economy with minimal losses for the working people. This is a task we both share, and that is why we need one another.

GDR's Gysi Meets Newsmen After Moscow Talks

LD1506121290 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Ivanovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—"The German reunification process can and must stimulate the all-European unifying process," Gregor Gysi, chairman of East Germany's Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS), told a news conference today, following "intensive talks" in the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee.

At the same time, he said, participants in the talks stated that granting NATO membership to a reunited Germany without any limitations would inevitably upset the military balance and, as a consequence, would destabilize the situation.

Gysi believes that consultations within the framework of the "two-plus-four" formula should prioritise work on a peace treaty.

In Moscow the two sides discussed the results of the recent Soviet-American summit and of the latest

meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, and relations between the CPSU and the PDS, Gysi said.

In response to journalists' questions, Gysi pointed out that the historically established close relations between the PDS and the CPSU do not rule out the possibility of the PDS developing contacts with communist parties in the Baltic republics, which declared their independence.

Polish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 18 Jun

LD1806174290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] A Polish parliamentary delegation, headed by Sejm Marshal Mikolaj Kozakiewicz, arrived in the Soviet capital today.

The delegation has been invited by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The speaker of the Senate of the National Assembly of Poland is to have a meeting with Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and to visit Zagorsk and Katyn.

Nikolaj Kozakiewicz is a professor, publicist and teacher. In 1985 he became a Sejm deputy and turned out to be one of a few who retained a deputy's mandate after the 1989 elections. The Sejm marshal, author of more than 30 scientific books, is a native of the Vilnius region and has fluent command of Russian.

Meets With Lukyanov

LD1806195890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1628 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov received today a delegation of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland, headed by Sejm Marshal Mikolaj Kozakiewicz. The delegation is paying an official visit to the Soviet Union. The two sides noted that the good-neighborly relations between the USSR and the Republic of Poland are based on the firm foundation of mutual interests which objectively manifest itself both in the way in which the Soviet Union and Poland tackle their own, internal problems and in their approach to international security and the development of the pan-European process. The intention to develop vigorously the parliamentary ties between the Soviet Union and Poland was expressed.

'Unofficially' Told of POW Graves

LD1806203790 Warsaw PAP in English 1924 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 18—There are many indications that the Soviet Union has decided to reveal the site where Polish prisoners of war from the camp at Ostashkov, murdered by the NKVD, are buried.

According to circles close to a delegation of the Polish Sejm (lower house) which began a visit to Moscow today, the Soviet authorities have unofficially told the Polish side that the site is situated in a forest near the locality of Miednoye on the Moscow-Leningrad route, 35 km north of Kalinin.

Mass graves of victims of Stalinist terror, most of them Soviet citizens, have been uncovered there recently. Although the graves of the Polish POWs have not been pinpointed, much goes to indicate that they rest there. The case is being looked into.

Polish Consul Demands Official Stand on Graves

LD1706215290 Warsaw PAP in English 2019 GMT
17 Jun 90

[By PAP correspondent Slowamir Popowski]

[Text] Moscow, June 17—In connection with reports in the Soviet press on finding near Kharkov tombs of Polish officers from the Starobyelsk camp executed by the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs; 1917-1946], Consul General of the Republic of Poland Michal Zorawski handed over a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry in which he asked the Soviet side to take an official stance of the issue.

The Polish consul also asked the Soviet side to allow a Polish representative to attend exhumation.

Polish Consul General in Kiev R. Polkowski met recently with representatives of the KGB leadership in Kharkov. The Kharkov KGB Head Gen. Nikolay Gibadulov said one could be sure in 99 per cent that it was Polish officers who were buried in the 6th section of the forest near Kharkov. Polish officers were shot dead at the Kharkov prison and their bodies were taken to the forest.

There is every indication that there are about 2,000 Soviet citizens buried in the 6th section and about 3,000 foreigners, including Poles. Testifying to this are remnants of uniforms.

The Kharkov KGB leadership said the investigation concerning the revealed tombs would be completed soon. The KGB Ukrainian authorities announced they would soon hand over to the Polish Consulate in Kiev a list of all Polish prisoners from Starobyelsk.

Border Crossing Procedures at Moldavia Simplified

LD1706204790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Report from the "Vremya" newscast by correspondent G. Klimov—first paragraph is announcer's introduction]

[Text] Simplified border crossing points have been set up in Moldavia for people who want to visit their relatives.

[Klimov] Just 50 meters separate this point and the bank of the Prut River. This is where the Soviet-Romanian

border runs. We are now at the Ungeny simplified crossing point. Only people resident in the border zone have the right to simplified crossing of the border. They assemble here at certain times on certain days. The only invitation needed is a telegram from the other side of the Prut. Whole families of visitors cross the border. Ties between members of families are re-established; trust and friendship are strengthened. The time taken to process the necessary documents has been shortened. Those resident in the border zones shortly will get inserts for their passports which will allow them to visit relatives in Romania without any restrictions.

[Unidentified border guard] Compared to 1985, the volume of simplified state border crossings has increased by more than six times. At the same time, I must say that in recent times there has been a sharp increase in the number of people attempting to breach the state border, usually with smuggled goods and with the aim of speculation.

[Klimov] Already dozens of criminal cases have been brought against persistent transgressors. The local residents have been given access to the river for fishing and relaxation, and litter is starting to gather on the banks. This is not the end of the world, so to speak, but now people have even started drowning in the Prut. It is time for the border guards set up a river rescue service. Such, then, are the negative consequences of border democratization. [video shows three border guards and a dog walking by border installation; people gathering to cross; bulletin board giving times for processing of documents: 1000-1200 and 1600-1800, but not on Sundays; formalities being completed in the crossing point; X-ray machine in background; customs house at Ungeny]

Protests Against Romanian Government Continue

LD1806215790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 18 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Following the tragic events of a few days ago in University Square in Bucharest, as noted by the French television company, Antenne-2, public opinion in Romania is in a state of shock just as before. The TIMES [not further specified] writes about the appearance of alarming pieces of evidence that the Romanian leadership coordinated the miners' actions. In its turn the Washington administration has adopted a decision to stop rendering economic aid to Romania until the democratic process is restored there. Our correspondent in Bucharest reports:

[S. Zheleznyak] The session started with a minute of silence. The parliamentarians stood to honor the memory of those who fell six months ago in the battles for the revolution and for those who died in the tragic events of last week. It was only after that that they set about ratifying the powers of the senators and deputies, the election of the chairman and vice chairmen of the chambers. Radu Campeanu, leader of the opposition

and head of the National Liberal Party, considers it necessary to set up a united parliamentary commission to investigate the crimes committed on 13-15 June.

It all started here in University Square when the bodies of law and order on the demands of the procuracy tried to clear the square of demonstrators. As the government later announced, that then served as the cause, or the signal, for an extremely well planned revolt against the country's lawful government elected on 20 May in a free, democratic manner. An important part in restoring order was played by 10,000 miners who arrived in Bucharest to help. Exceeding their powers, however, in an unauthorized manner, they set about seeking out the participants in and instigators of the revolt. As a result complete havoc was caused in the headquarters of the opposition parties. Innocent people suffered, about which the government has expressed regret. Their actions caused indignation among many Bucharest residents.

Late yesterday evening University Square was occupied by demonstrators yet again. Traffic in the city center was blocked off once again. Once again antigovernment and anticommunist slogans resounded. The demonstrators are blaming the miners and the country's president who, in an extreme situation, was forced to turn to the people for help, for the tragic events of last week. The situation in Bucharest remains tense. [video shows scenes inside parliament and the demonstrations in University Square]

West Europe

Reportage on Shevardnadze Visit With Genscher

Arrives in Munster 18 Jun

LD1806084290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0821 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Munster (Land of North Rhine-Westphalia), 18 Jun [no agency attribution as received]—Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, arrived here today. In accordance with an agreement, his one-day meeting will take place here with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG foreign minister.

At the Munster-Osnabruck airport the Soviet minister was met by H.-D. Genscher and other officials.

Conveys Gorbachev's Greetings

LD1806124690 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Munster June 18 TASS—A one-day working meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher opened here today. They will discuss the German issue and external aspects of Germany's reunification within the context of the CSCE.

Addressing the two ministers, Munster Oberburgomaster Joerg Twenhoven said: "I am glad to welcome you in this historic hall, where the 1648 Westphalia Peace Treaty was signed, putting an end to the devastating 30-year war. This is the birthplace of the motto: 'peace is the best cause.'"

"The Westphalia peace was based on the recognition of the realities that existed after the 30-year war and reconciliation among all the combatants. These principles remain topical. President Gorbachev's call to build a 'common European home' has paved the way to a new peace process on our continent. I wish success to your talks which, I hope, will make a weighty contribution to this process."

Shevardnadze thanked the host for his good wishes and for the warm welcome accorded the Soviet delegation in Munster. "At the present time," he said, "Europe is at a transitional stage. It is faced with the problem of restoring German unity and settling the external aspects of this process within the framework of the 'two-plus-four' mechanism. "We want our decisions to promote the creation of a new peaceful Europe and we are moving in that direction. I hope our present meeting will be fruitful. We are to discuss difficult problems, but each side has the good will to settle them."

Shevardnadze conveyed best wishes from President Gorbachev to the people of Munster.

The Soviet and West German foreign ministers signed the "golden book" of Munster's guests of honour. Then the talks began.

NATO, Pact, German Unity Discussed

LD1806115590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1105 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Excerpts] Munster, 18 Jun (TASS)—The external aspects of the construction of German unity in the context of the general European process are the main subjects of the one-day talks that started today between Eduard Shevardnadze and Hans-Dietrich Genscher. This is the fourth working meeting in the past month between the heads of the foreign policy departments of the USSR and FRG, during which an intensive search is being made to find a mutually acceptable solution to the aforementioned problems that are included in the agenda of the "two-plus-four" mechanism. [passage omitted]

At today's meeting of the USSR and FRG foreign ministers, as at their previous meeting in Brest, they will discuss the external aspects of German unity, of which the most complex is the issue of the military and political status of a united Germany. A solution to this would certainly be helped by the achievement of an accord on the principles of relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and on their transformation into mainly political alliances, and also by a lowering of the levels of military confrontation in Europe and the further development of the common European process and its institutionalization.

Since the process of transformation of the alliances and the creation of common European security structures needs time, the issue of the military and political status of a united Germany is a pressing one in the context of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in the transitional period.

The current talks in Munster will help prepare the scheduled meeting of the foreign ministers of the two German states and the four victorious powers under the "two-plus-four" formula, which is to take place in Berlin on 22 June.

More on German Unity

PM1906102590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Working Meeting"]

[Text] Munster, 18 Jun—USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher continued their discussion of the external aspects of building German unity during their meeting in this West German city.

On the premise that the relevant issues can only be considered in the broad European context and voicing the unanimous opinion that the situation in Europe must be radically improved, the ministers analyzed objectively the prospects for the development of the situation on the continent. The Soviet side stressed that the work of transforming the Warsaw Pact that began with the Political Consultative Committee declaration adopted in Moscow must be accompanied by corresponding practical steps from the North Atlantic alliance and a fundamental change in the nature of Warsaw Pact-NATO relations. H.-D. Genscher set out the West Germans' initial reaction to the specific ideas on this subject advanced by the Soviet minister at last week's meeting in Brest. Their views were found to coincide to a substantial degree on a whole series of fundamental issues.

The sides' ideas of the importance of the European process are consonant in many respects. They clarified their positions on questions of the forms of institutionalizing this process, holding a successful CSCE summit

meeting this year, and elaborating an agreement on reductions in conventional armed forces by the end of the year.

A considerable part of the ministers' conversation was devoted to frank dialogue on complex problems relating to the definitive international legal regularization of the external aspects of German unity. They confirmed their mutual desire to find the earliest solution that considers the anxieties of all interested parties.

Certain promising areas of business cooperation between the Soviet Union and the FRG and a united Germany were touched upon, along with questions of integrating the Soviet economy into the world economic system.

The current consultations between E.A. Shevardnadze and H.-D. Genscher were held as part of the preparations for the 22 June meeting between the foreign ministers of the six states within the framework of the "two plus four" mechanism.

E.A. Shevardnadze left for home at the end of the working meeting.

Merge of NATO-Pact Viewed

LD1806210290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 18 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: correspondent V. Kondratyev report from Munster, including Kondratyev's interview there with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze on 18 June—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] In the West German city of Munster today, one-day talks were held between Comrade Shevardnadze and Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

[Kondratyev] Why was Munster chosen? Surely there must be plenty of cities in the FRG which, after Brest with its historic symbolism where Shevardnadze's brother died defending the fortress, could host the next meeting of the two foreign ministers? We got the answer to that question immediately after the participants in the talks arrived at the town hall.

We all know from school about the 30 years war that raged on our continent in the seventeenth century, but not everyone remembers that it ended with the peace Treaty of Westphalia. It was precisely here, in the ancient hall in Munster, that that peace treaty was concluded. Mayor Twenhoeven told the guests about this in detail. He drew historical parallels, reminding us that at that time the European states found in themselves the strength to overcome hostility and to lay the foundations for sovereign, civilized development in the future.

At that time, Russia was on the sidelines of European affairs. Today, the common European home, an idea proclaimed by the Soviet president, is unthinkable without the participation of the Soviet Union.

The delegation then went into the hall, where the talks were to take place. No one expected a sensation today.

You see, in a few days the meeting of the Six is to take place in Berlin. Only that meeting is capable of adopting a decision. Bilateral consultations also are extraordinarily important.

At the FRG Foreign Ministry, as follows from reports in the press, they are not inclined to sharply decline the variant expressed a few days ago by President Gorbachev on the associated membership of a united Germany in both blocs, although the final German formula is still not in agreement with our own. Genscher's department thinks that Soviet troops remaining on German soil will, in any event, lead to an interweaving of the interests and spheres of competence of the two defensive alliances.

The German side singles out the four most important spheres: The transformation of the alliances into primarily political organizations; the creation of new structures within the framework of the Europe-wide process, including the Security Council; disarmament efforts during which the level of the German Army is to be determined, as well; and also the German border.

In the interval, we interviewed Comrade Shevardnadze: Eduard Amvrosievich, just one short question: Has a rapprochement taken shape on the controversial issues at today's meeting?

[Shevardnadze] With regard to many issues, a definite drawing together is appearing, especially with respect to the Europe-wide process, (its institutions and organizations), the formation of the pan-European structures. The future relations between the military-political alliances are taking shape in a very interesting manner. A dialogue, a good one, rich in content, is in prospect and is being obtained. We touched on bilateral relations, to a certain extent. Interesting directions also have revealed themselves. As far as the most difficult problems are concerned....

[Kondratyev, interrupting] Germany's membership in NATO?

[Shevardnadze] Not yet. We still have not started on that.

[Kondratyev] But is the position of the German side changing?

[Shevardnadze] I do not think so. We will see. Dialogue is dialogue. Discussion will show us.

[Kondratyev] In the evening, the ministers gave a news conference.

Genscher Comments on Talks

LD1806225290 Moscow TASS in English 2234 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Munster June 19 TASS—West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher described his working meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, which ended here on Monday, as very constructive and useful.

He was speaking at a joint news conference devoted to the results of the meeting. Genscher stressed that the talks enabled them to move ahead in solving a number of important issues.

Genscher said that he and Shevardnadze had arrived at the conclusion that there were many essential components that exercised their influence on the solution of the external aspects of German unification.

He said that these included first of all the institutionalization of the CSCE process, secondly, the acceleration of progress at the Vienna negotiations on conventional Armed Forces in Europe, thirdly, the solution of the Polish border issue, and fourthly, the settlement of the problem concerning the united Germany's military-political status.

The sides, Genscher continued to say, agreed about the need to overcome ideological differences and identify the new nature of relations between the two countries. All this will lead to boosting cooperation in Europe.

The talks also focused on aspects of interaction between the united Germany and the Soviet Union. The sides viewed in positive light prospects for the development of cooperation in all spheres.

Eduard Shevardnadze agreed with Genscher's assessment of the meeting and stressed that it had been useful and necessary and had been held "in a good, humanly warm atmosphere". He said much work had been done.

Shevardnadze dwelt on a number of problems. He said that it would be appropriate to foreground the problems of forming European-scale structures and the development of the CSCE process because it meets the interests of all peoples of the continent. The settlement of external aspects of German unification, he said, depend on the development of the CSCE process. During his talks with Genscher, a nearly complete identity of their viewpoints surfaced.

Shevardnadze said that the idea of establishing qualitatively new relations between the two alliances—the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation—was a relatively new element in the talks. He added that the sides presented their views on the matter in a special message addressed to the foreign ministers of European countries. New relations between the two alliances will be built on the basis of their profound transformation in response to the call of the times, Shevardnadze stressed.

The Soviet minister noted that during the talks the viewpoints of the two countries on a number of issues coincided or became closer to one another. At the same

time, he pointed out, there remained a number of major problems requiring solution. Intensive work was continuing at the expert level.

The ministers responded to some questions from journalists. Asked about prospects for the development of cooperation with the Soviet Union, Genscher expressed West Germany's interest in deepening links in the economic, scientific and cultural fields. Shevardnadze in turn stressed the Soviet Union's desire to develop relations with East and West Germanys and the future united Germany. This cooperation, he pointed out, must be built on the basis of mutual benefit and equality.

Asked about cuts in the Budget, the Soviet minister said that this question would be discussed not only in Vienna but also within the framework of the Two-Plus-Four negotiations, because it related to external aspects of German unification.

Both ministers noted the importance of the rapid progress at the Vienna talks for a successful CSCE summit later this year.

Shevardnadze Leaves for Moscow

*LD1806183690 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT
18 Jun 90*

[Text] Munster, West Germany June 18 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze flew from Munster to Moscow today on completing a working meeting with West German Foreign minister Hans Dietrich Genscher.

Pilot Lands Aircraft in Turkey, Seeks Asylum

*NC1806135090 Paris AFP in English 1237 GMT
18 Jun 90*

[Text] Istanbul, June 18 (AFP)—A Soviet pilot landed his plane in Turkey on Monday and asked for political asylum, military sources said here.

Valeriy Yurievitch, a 28-year-old civilian pilot, landed his 10- to 15-seater aircraft near the Turkish village of Kumcagiz, near Izmit, after taking off from the Black Sea city of Odessa in the Soviet Union, the sources said.

Mr. Yurievitch, who was alone in the aircraft, had asked for political asylum, they added. Regional officials said that the defector had landed in Turkey at 1:00 p.m.

More on German Pilot's Intrusion of Airspace

*PM1606175190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6*

[TASS correspondent Ye. Ali-Zade report, specially for IZVESTIYA, under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "The Batumi Incident: Before and After"]

[Text] Ankara—As already reported, an unmarked light-engined aircraft violated the USSR's air space from the

Turkish side 9 June, landed at Batumi airport, and then returned unhindered to the neighboring country. At IZVESTIYA's request, the TASS correspondent in Ankara now reports some of the background details to this incident.

The German pilot who recently violated Soviet air space in the Batumi area was on his way to Iran. He landed at Van airport in Turkey to await permission to enter Iranian territory.

The story behind this mysterious crossing, which attracted virtually no attention from the local press, began in the city of Trabzon. It was at the airport in that ancient Black Sea city that Hans Ulrich Schneider, an FRG citizen, landed. His reason for landing was to refuel. Thus Trabzon was in a way the starting point of this journey which, geographically speaking, is very hard to call logical. It was more like the flight of a bee on a hot summer day. For some reason Schneider, heading north from Trabzon, decided to call in at Batumi. He then headed east, to Iran, and then turned southwest and landed at Van.

As West German TV representatives in Ankara have reported, Hans Ulrich Schneider is a professional photographer. His sphere of activity is the Near East or, to be more precise, two neighboring countries in that region: Iran and Iraq. He has already carried out numerous photo assignments for client companies in those countries in areas usually reached by small plane. Local journalists have no information about the nature of the photographs or the clients.

After taking off from Trabzon on 9 June, according to the Anatolian News Agency, the German pilot entered Soviet air space by crossing the Soviet-Turkish border over the checkpoint near the village of Sarpi. After that, according to the local agency's information, Schneider's plane "came under fire for violating the Soviet Union's air border and was forced to continue its flight over Turkey." After flying along the Soviet-Turkish border Schneider entered Iranian airspace in the region of Kars. However, the Anatolian News Agency writes, despite having prior permission of the Iranian authorities, he was not allowed to continue his flight. The German pilot then returned to Turkey and made a forced landing at Van airport. As the agency correspondent reports, staffers of the Van security administration examined the plane but could find no signs of shooting. Schneider himself persistently asked to be allowed to travel to Tabriz. After receiving the necessary permission from the Iranian authorities, the German pilot crossed into Iran. This is all that is known about this mysterious flight and violation of Soviet airspace which, according to a USSR Defense Ministry statement, was carried out for "provocative purposes."

Aeroflot Hijacker Seeks Asylum in Finland

LD1906104690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1020 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Voitto Leskinen]

[Text] Helsinki, 19 Jun (TASS)—One of the hijackers of the Aeroflot Tu-134 aircraft with 54 passengers on board, which was flying from Riga to Murmansk, and landed this morning at Helsinki Vanta Airport, has given himself up to the Finnish authorities.

According to a report from the Finnish Telegraph Buro a representative of the Finnish Ministry of Internal Affairs said that all passengers, crew, and the aircraft are safe. One of the hijackers who gave himself up to the Finnish authorities, after talks were held, intends to ask for political asylum.

The police are continuing their investigation.

Hijackers Armed With Grenade

LD1906120290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1108 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Helsinki, 19 Jun (TASS)—According to unofficial reports at the airport and at the Aeroflot representation, the criminals who hijacked the plane were armed with a grenade. So far, only one has surrendered, while two have still apparently to be recognized from among the passengers. The terrorist who surrendered was born in 1970.

Finnish Congress on Baltics, Environment

PM1906105790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Shmyganskii: "Politics Plus Ecology: New Emphases in the Finnish Social Democratic Program"]

[Excerpts] Helsinki—The press called the latest, 35th congress of the Finnish Social Democratic Party (SSDP) "an attempt to resolve the crisis." The newspapers recall that the SSDP lost 100,000 votes in the last parliamentary elections. [passage omitted]

The congress favored galvanizing efforts to create a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, a nuclear-free Baltic, and cuts in Finland's military expenditure.

New emphases emerged in the military-political sphere. At the delegates' insistence, the question of the situation in the Soviet Baltic region was moved from the section on relations with the USSR to the section on ties with countries in the Baltic region. The SSDP has thereby essentially given direct support to the present course adopted by Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Delegates from these republics (including M. Lauristin) made a point of ignoring other Soviet guests and did not respond to their greetings.

But all these political games receded into the background when an SSDP-organized international seminar on environmental problems began within the congress framework. The SSDP was the first of the country's political parties to offer a developed environmental program, in 1969. Many of its proposals are still relevant today. And now it seems that the Social Democrats are making the environment one of the most important instruments of their policy.

P. Paasio said that up to 90 percent of the pollution affecting Finnish territory comes from neighboring countries. He called Soviet combines on the Kola Peninsula "destructor plants" and reminded people that 15 hectares [as published] of forest disappear in Lapland every year as a result of harmful emissions. The party chairman urged that more funds be allocated for environmental aid to other states: "That way we will also be helping ourselves."

N. Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, taking part in the seminar's work, admitted that the quantity of sulfur, for example, carried from the Soviet Union to Finland is one-and-a-half to three times higher than the "reciprocal supplies" from Finland. At the same time, he stressed that the Soviet Union has managed to reduce its sulfur emissions by 23 percent.

It must be said that the two countries' scientists and specialists cannot agree on ways to neutralize emissions from the "Pechenganikel" and "Severonikel" combines. The Finns believe that their purification technology is more effective than the promised new Soviet equipment, as yet untested. In any case, the decision to cut sulfur emissions by 50 percent in 1993 no longer suits both sides.

East European countries' environmental policies were sharply criticized by Norwegian Labor Party leader Gro Harlem Brundtland, who is head of the International Commission for the Environment and Development. She called for broader international cooperation aimed at restructuring industry in these countries, which functions at the expense of catastrophic damage to nature and people's health. Brundtland spoke out in favor of a stronger role for the governments and public of East European countries in matters concerning environmental protection, particularly in the painful period of making the transition to a market economy.

UK's Thatcher Seeks To Reduce Armed Forces

PM1806093590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Prime Minister Has Given Instructions"]

[Text] London—THE DAILY TELEGRAPH today reports that British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has "given Alan Clark, minister for defense procurement, instructions to develop radical proposals to reduce

the country's Armed Forces and to prepare recommendations on working out an alternative military strategy both for Britain itself and for NATO as a whole."

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH notes that A. Clark is an advocate of considerable cuts in expenditure on the country's surface fleet and that he favors a reduction in the size of Britain's Rhine Army, deployed in the FRG. M. Thatcher consulted with A. Clark when preparing her speech to the recent NATO Council session at foreign minister level in the Scottish town of Turnberry. In this speech she pointed, in particular, to the need to review the North Atlantic Alliance's strategy in light of the steps being taken by the Soviet Union in the sphere of reducing its military presence in East Europe and achieving a possible agreement on conventional arms in Europe at the Vienna talks.

At the same time—as was clear from M. Thatcher's recent House of Commons address, in which she briefed deputies on the results of her visit to the Soviet Union—the government does not intend to review its program of modernization for Britain's strategic nuclear forces.

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine Parliamentarians Meet Komplektov

PM1806160190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks in the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] On 14 June V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, met with a delegation of Argentine parliamentarians headed by Senator A. Rodriguez Saa. There was a constructive exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Argentinian cooperation, and mutual interest was expressed in extending and improving it. V.P. Maslin, USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee; and G. de Prat Gay, Argentine ambassador in Moscow, participated in the meeting.

Confer With Supreme Soviet Official

PM1406162190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Toward the Development of Contacts"]

[Text] The continuation of the constant contacts and exchange of experience with Soviet parliamentarians begun in 1973 is the aim of a visit to the USSR by a delegation from the Argentine Republic's National Congress headed by A. Rodriguez Saa, chairman of the ruling Justicialist Party bloc in the Senate. The delegation arrived in our country on an official visit 12 June at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the following day the guests had a meeting with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities.

The delegation members were informed of the Soviet parliament's activity in the sphere of the legislative consolidation and safeguarding of the perestroika processes taking place in the country. At the same time the problems which must be confronted in the process of political and economic transformations in the Soviet Union were related without embellishment. These include the destabilization of the economic mechanism, difficulties in financial and money circulation, and sharp conflicts in a number of areas on ethnic grounds. It was noted in this connection that this difficult path has been chosen for the sake of a better future for the Soviet people, and that there is no going back on this road. R.N. Nishanov expressed his confidence that the achievement of the projected plans will lead in the next one to two years to substantial changes for the better.

The following took part in the conversation: A.A. Mokuanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; V.P. Maslin and S.G. Lushchikov, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and also G. de Prat Gay, Argentine ambassador to the USSR.

Nicaraguan Troop Reduction Plan Submitted

LD0806102490 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT
8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov]

[Text] Managua June 8 TASS—Acting commander-in-chief of the Nicaraguan Armed Forces General Umberto Ortega submitted to President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro on Thursday an "overall plan for the reduction and restructuring of the army".

An official communique issued here by the military command points out that the document was drawn up on the president's instructions.

De Chamorro asked General Ortega, who held the post of defence minister in the Sandinista government, to draft a "programme for reducing the armed forces, maintaining public law and order, subordinating servicemen to civilian authorities and making them respect the Constitution."

The communique says nothing about the scope and character of the reduction. However, it was learned that it is to begin after all Contras formations are demobilised. The demobilisation is to be completed by June 10, in keeping with several accords between the government and leaders of the "Nicaraguan resistance".

The government has issued no reports on the demobilisation of Contras over the past two days. Many people believe this process will not be completed by the fixed date. An official spokesman for the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry told TASS that not more than 75 per cent of the 15,000 Contras would be demobilised by June 10. "However," he said, "this is a major progress, since it testifies to the irreversibility of the process."

"Nicaraguan resistance" leaders laid the blame for this delay on the International Commission for Support and Supervision, operating under the aegis of the United Nations and the Organisation of American States, which is charged with the demobilisation of Contras. They claim the commission "is physically unable to disarm all resistance fighters before June 10."

The mass media, controlled by the opposition Sandinista Front, raises the problem of employing former servicemen, discharged in accordance with the "overall plan for reducing and restructuring the army". They accuse the government of planning to "dump several thousand soldiers and officers, without taking care of their future."

At the same time, the Sandinista press notes that the government not only provides demobilised Contras with every condition for a decent life and employment in so-called "development poles", but also guarantees them participation in bodies of power.

Contras' Demobilization Still Incomplete

LD1106075390 Moscow TASS in English 0737 GMT
11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Dmitriyev and Igor Pshenichnikov]

[Text] Managua June 11 TASS—The demobilisation of Contras was not completed by June 10, the date fixed by several accords between the Government of Nicaragua and "Nicaraguan resistance" leaders (NR).

1,886 NR militants laid down arms in various "security zones" on Sunday, Fernando Costanon, spokesman of the U.N. international peace-keeping force in Central America, told TASS. A total of 11,228 Contras were demobilised by June 10. There are still at least four thousand "Nicaraguan resistance" members, which are expected to be disarmed during this week at the present pace of demobilisation.

About 800 militants of the Indian nationalistic "Yatamo" group, acting on the Atlantic coast of the Republic, are expected to be demobilised shortly. Representatives of the international U.N. force and the international support and verification commission, acting under the auspices of the United Nations and the Organisation of American States, explain the delay in Contras' demobilisation by "technical impossibility of completing it by June 10".

Two days ago the U.N. Security Council prolonged the mandate issued to the U.N. international force up to June 29. This decision actually fixes another time limit for the complete demobilisation of rebels.

The newspaper BARRICADA, the official publication of the Sandinista Front, accused the government of not demanding from the Contras a scrupulous fulfilment of the disarmament accords. "The process of establishing peace remains unstable under these conditions," the

newspaper editorial says. "It is obvious that there are people among the Contras who wish to prevent a complete demobilisation. This may result in a dangerous situation."

For its part, the government did not issue any statement on the expiration of the official time limit for Contras demobilisation. It was expected to appear on Sunday. Government spokesmen earlier said the process could not be completed by June 10. However, they said, it should not cause anxiety, because the process of "Nicaraguan resistance" disarmament was "irreversible".

Nicaraguan Political, Economic Problems Viewed

PM2205111890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Gennadiy Zafesov under the rubric "Viewpoint": "The Path of War Is Narrow"]

[Text] The changing of the guard in a country's leadership is an extremely tricky process. Even in cases where the outgoing power displays goodwill toward the new power. Especially in a country like Nicaragua, where a war raged for more than eight years and the Sandinistas were forced to take up arms to defend their revolution. I would say that the echoes of gunfire still ring out over this small Central American country, although there is hope that they will soon die away finally. I would like to believe that the disarming of the Contras will be taken to its logical conclusion and the danger of political confrontation in which shots were the supreme argument will disappear forever.

The new political experience being acquired in Nicaragua today is highly unusual for Latin America. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that "yesterday's" authorities, in the form of the Sandinist National Liberation Front (FSLN), having lost the general elections in February, is by no means left on the sidelines. Furthermore the Sandinist leadership is cooperating with the new President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro. Due credit must also be given to the president herself, who has not given up her regular political consultations with the "losers."

Incidentally, the quotation marks around that last word are particularly appropriate, because in the elections 41 percent of the voters voted for the Sandinistas. A political force that enjoys that degree of popularity simply must be reckoned with.

However, not everyone in Nicaragua shares the prudence and the realistic approach of the new head of state. Things are further complicated by the fact that even within the opposition national union, which in fact brought V. Barrios de Chamorro to the presidency, there has been a split. There too there are "left" and "right." There are also plenty of people who call for a "settling of scores" with the Sandinistas and say that they should be "called to account" both for the mistakes they really did make and for those that they were not to blame for. In

politics, excessive emotion is a luxury, sometimes a ruinous one, especially when the country is in a critical economic situation.

I do not think I am laying it on too thick. Nicaragua's foreign debt is more than \$11 billion. This sum is impressive in itself, and for a country with such a modest economic potential as Nicaragua it is frankly disastrous. President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro has asked U.S. President G. Bush to grant her government an immediate short-term loan of \$40 million. Otherwise Nicaragua will be forced next month to declare itself unable to pay its existing financial commitments. In effect this request is nothing less than a distress signal.

But it would be unfair to say that the Nicaraguan president is relying solely on support from Washington. Certain measures, which, it is true, are in many ways contentious, are being adopted within the country too. A decree has been adopted, for instance, on confiscated property and land leasing. The latter basically negates the Sandinist land reform. There is no need to explain the reaction prompted among the peasants who received land from the revolution by this decree, which provides for the return of confiscated land to the former Latifundist landowners. One can also understand the reaction of the FSLN when its best initiatives are abolished by a stroke of the presidential pen. It is surely paradoxical, in this context, that the president's critics on the right accuse Violeta Barrios de Chamorro of making a "deal" with the Sandinistas!

Among other acts of the new government is a 100-percent devaluation of the national monetary unit—the cordoba. This reflects first and foremost the depth of the financial crisis in Nicaragua, where in recent years the rise in prices has become frankly fantastic. Drinking water has doubled in price. The cost of electricity has increased 300 percent, and telephone services—1,300 percent. Naturally, in this situation the poor are becoming even poorer. A recently adopted law on the state service deprived employees of social guarantees. Some 30,000 people declared a strike, which was only ended with great difficulty.

The atmosphere in the country is so heated that some people are beginning to talk about civil war. In this atmosphere the tiniest spark could lead to a major conflagration. But who needs a seat of warfare in Nicaragua? After all, eight years and more of war had apparently convinced everyone that you cannot use armed force to resolve problems that require patience, perspicacity, and hard work. I will not offer readymade formulas, but as you know, there is a way out of every situation. Even the most difficult. But it can only be found through mutual concessions, consolidation, and cooperation among various political forces, not hostility between them.

The path of war never leads to the highway of prosperity and stability. It is too narrow, winding, and dangerous. Even for those who see it as the most radical way out of a complex situation.

Supreme Soviet Session

Correction to Gorbachev's Speech to Supreme Soviet WA1806165990

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Gorbachev Speaks to Supreme Soviet 12 Jun," published in the 13 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 50-57. Page 53, column two, paragraph three, last sentence reads: This is a chance for a transition from age-old alienation to recognized interconnection, and to organic interaction and codevelopment, and we must, naturally, not miss this chance.

Today, however, this path [toward European integration] is inseparable from the ongoing processes toward the unification of the two German states. I consider it essential—here on this lofty platform—to declare once again that we regard the Germans' longing to live in one state with complete understanding. But German unification has external aspects, too. These include the border question; the question of a unified Germany's military-political status; the question of the rights of the four powers that were victorious in the Second World War. The future of peace and security in Europe largely depend on how these questions are resolved. For understandable reasons, the just solution to all these problems is of particular significance to our country and our people. Our people's historic memory, together with its concern for the future of future generations, requires that everything must be done to ensure that the country's security is reliably safeguarded—even in the conditions of the abrupt changes that are occurring in Europe. This approach of ours is fully in line with the interests of all other peoples in Europe, not least the German people.

A particularly important time is now upon us. How can we combine further pan-European progress with a just settlement to the external aspects of a unified Germany? Combine them in such a way that the mighty and promising trend toward placing the whole of European life on a new footing does not go for naught. The stakes are too high. That which is going on in the world at the moment is too important for us to allow ourselves to come to grief over a single, all be it extremely complicated problem.

The main thing is—without discriminating against anyone, even in the course of the search—jointly to find a way of resolving the German question that is suited to the constructive vector of the pan-European process and which would promote greater confidence and not the destruction of what has already been accomplished. A way that would be lasting and would, in some measure, as far as possible, be synchronized with the European processes. There could be various ways of going about such a synchronization.

I said to President Bush that, instead of insisting on a unified Germany's membership of NATO, would it not be better to consider how to bring together the blocs that still divide Europe? For if we want to put an end once

and for all to the division of the continent, then we must bring the military-political institutions into line with the trends toward unification that are present in pan-European process.

As far as the Warsaw Pact is concerned, then now, in the wake of the recent Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, it is setting about reviewing its very nature in accordance with the changes in the whole situation in Europe. For this reason we have every right to expect NATO to set about meeting us halfway. We would welcome changes to the alliance's military doctrine that was engendered by the cold war. Moreover, we would welcome it if this occurred at the upcoming July meeting of NATO's council in London.

Within this framework the issue of guaranteeing the security of a united Germany would also be tackled in a new way, let's say by constructing it on two pillars, not just in the West but also in the East. By way of hypothesis, this could be some form of associated membership of two alliances—while these exist—on the part of the new German state. Such dual membership could become a linking element, a sort of precursor of new European structures. We also do not rule out the possibility that NATO and the Warsaw Pact will survive in some form for a longer period of time than can at the moment be foreseen, and they could conclude an agreement taking into account the emergence of a united Germany and also the transformation of their own organizations.

One way or another, it is clear that some sort of transitional period cannot be avoided. A united Germany could declare that in this period it will observe all the obligations it has inherited from the FRG and the GDR; and that during this period the Bundeswehr would continue to be subordinate to NATO, while the troops in the GDR would be subordinate to the government of the new Germany. Simultaneously, for the transitional period Soviet troops would remain on the territory of today's GDR. Thus, the concern of many countries would be lifted and the formation of the future structures of all-European security would be encouraged.

We said to the President that if at any moment of the transitional period the United States gets the feeling that the Soviet Union is attempting to infringe its interests, Washington would have an unconditional right to withdraw from the accords and to take appropriate unilateral actions. On the other hand, it must be clearly understood that if we get the impression that we are not being reckoned with on the German question, the positive processes in Europe will find themselves in serious jeopardy. This is no bluff. With due regard for the fundamental interests of the people, we would have to stop and take stock of the situation. There is no need to say that one would very much not like to see such a turn of events. I think I have properly understood the main roots of the present U.S. position on Germany's joining NATO. Washington considers the U.S. military presence in Europe as a factor for stability and wants to keep it. I

19 June 1990

told the President that I considered that the U.S. presence in Europe is not a problem for us, inasmuch as it plays a certain role as far as stability is concerned and is an element of the strategic situation. Reality will tell what will happen in the future. Europe is the natural center of world politics, and if distortions are allowed here, the consequences will affect the whole world. Soviet-U.S. cooperation is one of the pillars on which European political stability rests. At the same time, I consider it a methodological mistake—and I told George Bush this—to strive to tie the U.S. presence in Europe exclusively to NATO, and to regard the FRG's withdrawal from NATO as the beginning of the end of this alliance, and thus of the end of the U.S. military presence on the continent. We do not agree with this inference, but we take cognizance of the United States concern, particularly with regard to today's realities. What was the reaction to our position in Washington? Bush kept attempting to clarify why we fear Germany's joining NATO, tried to assure us that everything would come out alright and that there was no intention to encroach on our interests and security.

They are prepared to take them into consideration and have formulated nine points through Secretary of State Baker. Our position is that we have agreed, would agree, to entry if you, the United States, and NATO, took an associative part. This is the principle of rapprochement between the blocs, taking place in tandem with the process of German unification. During this the current obligations of both the FRG and GDR will not change provided that, at the same time, the blocs reform themselves organizationally in accordance with the Vienna and all-European processes.

The dialectics here are very complicated. But it has to be said that if, prior to my trip to Washington, both Washington itself, the President, and the Europeans had taken up iron positions, as we say, in these cases, reflections have now begun. Reflections have begun. We would like, and this is the Soviet Union's position, solutions to be found precisely and jointly that would be part of the overall positive trends of change in Europe and throughout the world, strengthening security rather than shaking it or reducing it. The search for such decisions continues at the moment.

There has already been another brief meeting between Eduard Amvrosevich Shevardnadze and James Baker in Copenhagen. I had talks with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. We agreed to instruct our ministries of foreign affairs to deal with this matter specially and on a bilateral basis. Yesterday, our minister of foreign affairs met with Genscher, FRG minister of foreign affairs, in Brest. It is too soon to be talking about results but we will continue these efforts, full of goodwill and responsibility.

I also have to say that we can also see growing understanding for our arguments and concerns from the other side. I can assure you deputies that during further meetings, in particular, the meeting soon to be held

between the foreign ministers of the United States, the USSR Great Britain, France, the FRG and the GDR, in Berlin, we will unfailingly defend the interests of our country's security while recognizing the right of the other states to equal security, showing the necessary flexibility and taking into account the interests of all the states involved.

The regional problems of the world: The responsibility of the two states is not limited to Europe, although this is a key point. Without a solution here, matters will not proceed as they should throughout the world.

But if measures to demilitarize world politics in general are not taken, and the whole international situation, burdened by an attitude of confrontation and heavy too with armed conflicts, the peaceful period of history will turn into a utopia and talk of attaining a new civilization will not even be possible. That is why, relatively speaking, regional problems remain one of the most important components of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

This time, the greater part of our Camp David conversations were devoted to them. Only very recently, it was regional conflicts in particular that were the source of grave complications in relations between the USSR and the United States. In an atmosphere of confrontation, almost any conflict of this kind will automatically become a reason for increasing East-West confrontation. Essentially, everything that happened in the world at that time was seen through the prism of confrontation.

At Camp David a new approach prevailed linked to rejecting regional conflicts as a matter for rivalry between the two powers. I have to say that it is the first time that it was like this. Both sides now see regional conflicts as a calamity both for the actual countries involved and as a negative feature at the international level. There is a common understanding that it is essential to do everything to stop these conflicts, to settle them, as soon as possible, and, moreover, not on the battlefield but through political means and talks.

It is, therefore, possible to say that the criteria of the new thinking are becoming the determining features in the approach of the USSR and the United States of America to this area of international politics. It would, of course, be an exaggeration to say that President Bush and I were agreed on everything or that there was a complete coincidence of views. We noted, for example, that the U.S. attitude to Cuba is fraught as before with complexes inherited from the cold war and we reject suspicions regarding the nature of our relations with Cuba. These are built on a delusion. Our position is unchanging: We favour the normalization of U.S.-Cuban relations. The Soviet Union is ready to, and indeed will facilitate this if both sides appeal to do it. As they say, the ball here is in the U.S. court.

We discussed every aspect of the Near East conflict very thoroughly and found important points of contact in certain assessments of the causes for the periodical exacerbation of the situation and for the general block on

a settlement. Our position of principle is well-known and there is no need to reproduce it here. Given nuances in our conversation partner's approach, it seems that by and large the understanding emerged at Camp David that it is, ultimately, necessary to work toward convening an international conference and for both sides to act accordingly.

Naturally, the matter of settling immigrants from the Soviet Union on Israel-occupied Palestinian lands was touched upon. The President said clearly that the United States opposes the creation of new immigrant settlements beyond the 1967 line, i.e. on the Israeli-occupied territories. This was a most important statement in the context of our meeting. For our part, taking into account our discussions on this problem with the presidents of Syria and Egypt, Al-Assad and Mubarak, we recently stated the following in Moscow: Either our joint concern will be heeded in Israel and some concessions drawn there or the Soviet Union will have to think about the consequences, whether permission to leave should not temporarily be suspended for citizens of Jewish nationality until there is an appropriate assurance from the Israeli side. (adding dropped passage, incorporating comparison with PRAVDA version)

Comparison of Gorbachev Supreme Soviet Address PM1306134790

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 13 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on pages 1 and 2 an unattributed report entitled "M.S. Gorbachev's Address at the Third Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet." Comparison of the PRAVDA item with the translation of the Moscow Television Russian version published in the 13 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 50-57, reveals the following variations:

Page 50, column two, paragraph six, first sentence reads: This enabled Soviet-U.S. relations to get through very serious tests in connection with events in our country, and the stormy process which have developed since autumn last year in East Europe. (rewording)

Page 51, column one, first full paragraph, only sentence reads: Secondly, to what degree is policy influenced by orientation towards short-term gains or the obtaining of benefits by taking advantage of the other side's difficulties, and of attendant complications of a transient nature in the international arena? (rewording)

Page 52, column two, second full paragraph, third sentence reads: In short, the formula of unrestricted transfer of nuclear weapons and the means of their modernization to the British is unacceptable to us. The talk has been of replacing Trident I's with Trident II's—and only that. Here they now want to put forward a general formula which would make it possible and which would open up a channel for circumventing a Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive armaments. Once again this is impermissible and unacceptable. (rewording)

Page 52, column two, paragraph five, third sentence reads: If we and the Americans agree to reduce and destroy nuclear weapons while, all around us, missile technology is being acquired for nuclear weapons, then everything will keep on having to be started from scratch. But it is to be borne in mind that at least 13 states already possess the ability to have nuclear weapons. (rewording)

Page 53, column two, first full paragraph, second sentence reads: Now the task of technology will stand before us—how can this be done safely? (rewording)

Page 53, column two, first full paragraph, last sentence reads: There was an exchange of views with the President on this matter—concerning cooperation in the sphere of technology for the destruction, with a view to exchanging technologies for destroying chemical weapons. (rewording)

Page 53, column two, third paragraph, last sentence reads: this is a chance for a transition from age-old alienation to a recognized interconnection and voluntary accord and to organic interaction, taking into account genuine national interests, and we must not miss this chance. (rewording)

Page 54, column two, paragraph one, sentence two reads: He has given me precedence to the main issue in world politics, and has not given way to the opportunist, temporary considerations to which many were urging him, and indeed, continue to urge. (rewording)

Page 55, column one, sixth paragraph, last sentence reads: A protocol of intent between the USSR Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry, the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR, the Tengizneftegaz Production Association and the Chevron firm determines the procedure for including the Tengiz oil field in the joint enterprise (Sovshevroil) at the Korolevskoye oil field. (confirming names)

Page 55, column two, third full paragraph, fourth sentence reads: I think, however, that it is a matter of time. We have a large unsatisfied demand for telephone communications. (rewording)

Page 56, column one, first partial paragraph, first sentence reads: U.S. business and scientific circles, especially on the west coast, in San Francisco and Stanford, drew attention to a proposal on the joint development of the natural bases of Siberia and the Far East, and inquired about the idea of free enterprise zones in the region of Nakhodka and elsewhere. In short, what is called bilateral relations, and what was achieved in this area as a result of the summit meeting expands the opportunities for practical involvement of the Soviet Union in the system of the world market and the international division of labor. (rewording)

Page 56, column one, second full paragraph, first sentence reads: The success of the summit was the result not only of the new character of the dialogue between the

presidents (although this was the most important thing, of course) in general on the political level, and not only of the official negotiations for which, speaking for our part, great merit belongs to Comrades Shevardnadze and Bessmertnykh, the present ambassador in the United States. (rewording)

Page 56, column one, same paragraph, sentence three reads: Among them I would like to name Comrade Maslyukov and a large group of people's deputies: Primakov, Osipyan, Akhromeyev, Velikhov, Falin, Arbatov, Likhachev, Ryzhov, Burlatskiy, Kruchina, Yefremov, Dzasokhov, and also Yagodin, Dobrynin, and Chairman of the Chamber of Trade Malkevich. Others whom I will not name here, including journalists and public figures, whose harmonious work was coordinated by Comrade Grachev, also deserve thanks. (rewording)

Page 57, column one, first paragraph, sentence three reads: Incidentally, on the subject of the conference, it should be remarked this was the first time it had assembled with those members. (rewording)

Page 57, column one, same paragraph, sentence seven reads: it is important that a large measure of accord was reached on all such main, fundamental, and important questions as an assessment of the role of the Warsaw Pact and the need for its reconstruction, considering the creation of a new European security structure and implementing the idea of the common European home. (rewording)

Page 57, column one, same paragraph, last sentence reads: The need was underscored for continuing cooperation in all spheres.

Returning to the summits in the United States and Canada, while voicing my satisfaction over the outcome, I would warn at the same time against the habit that afflicts us all of resting content with what is reflected in the documents, statements, and reports. (adding phrase)

Comparison of Ryzhkov Supreme Soviet Report PM2505143990

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 25 May 1990 carries in its Second Edition on pages 1-4 the speech by Soviet Premier N.I. Ryzhkov at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "On the Country's Economic Position and the Concept for the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy," with the translation of the Moscow TV Russian version published in the 25 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 37-57, reveals the following variations:

Page 37, column two, last paragraph, first sentence reads: In preparing the proposal on switching to a market economy, the economic situation in the country was analyzed in the most careful way.

The Country's Socioeconomic Position

Evidently there is no need to dwell on the profound causes of the ills in the national economy. (adding subhead)

Page 38, column one, paragraph four, first sentence reads: Compare the following figures. (deleting words)

Page 38, column two, paragraph three, last sentence reads: To this should be added a fall in economic discipline, especially in the filling of state orders and the fulfillment of contractual obligations. (adding word)

Page 39, column two, second full paragraph, last sentence reads: In order to extricate it from the crisis, to impart dynamism to the country's social and economic development, to achieve a real improvement in the life of Soviet people, a decisive transition to a regulated market economy is needed.

General Provisions and Possible Consequences of the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy

Comrades, the conclusion that it was necessary to switch to market relations as a fundamentally different model of economic management as opposed to the system of distribution by directive was reached in the country as long ago as 1987. (adding subhead)

Page 40, column two, second full paragraph, penultimate sentence reads: Indeed the state would not be ready to help them either because it would not be able to halt the unravelling of the inflationary processes in this situation. (rewording)

Page 41, column two, paragraph four, last sentence reads: Already at this stage, development of diverse forms of ownership, support of business enterprise, improvements in the structure of production along with the implementation of the appropriate financial and credit policy should decisively improve the situation in the consumer market. (rewording)

Page 42, column one, first full paragraph, first sentence reads: It should be stated frankly that in the option that is being proposed the period of transition is not expected to be easy. Calculations show that a certain recession in production is inevitable, that there will be a considerable reduction in the volume of capital investment, particularly during the first two years. (rewording)

Page 42, column one, second full paragraph, only sentence reads: Permit me now to dwell upon some key problems in the transition to a regulated market economy and to explain the government's position on the main directions for resolving them.

Financial and Credit Policy

Comrades! As has already been noted, the transition to a regulated market economy is impossible without the implementation of a very tough financial and credit policy. (adding subhead)

Page 42, column one, paragraph six, first sentence reads: It is fundamentally important here that we at last get away from the individual norms which were brought down to enterprise level. (rewording)

Page 44, column one, paragraph four, last sentence reads: The USSR Council of Ministers requests support for this proposal.

Pricing Reform

Comrades, the reform of price formation is a most important condition for all the future economic transformations in the country. (adding subhead)

Page 45, column one, paragraph five, sentence two reads: For example, a kilo of beef costs the state R5.88 and the average retail price in the state retail sector comes to R1.81. (changing number)

Page 46, column one, fourth full paragraph, sentence seven reads: This could be done from 1 July this year. (adding date)

Page 46, column one, same paragraph, last sentence reads: The government requests the Supreme Soviet to support the proposal to introduce new retail prices for bread and flour products from 1 July. (deleting words)

Page 46, column two, second full paragraph, second sentence reads: Prices for electricity and fuel for domestic purposes, and tariffs for heating, water supplies, and passenger transportation will remain in the area of state control. (rewording)

Page 46, column two, third full paragraph, last sentence reads: We are obliged to preserve the standard of living that has been attained to the maximum extent possible and especially to take trouble over those of the population who are inadequately provided for.

Social Support System for the Population

In proposing that such a large-scale retail price reform should be carried out, the government thinks that it cannot be implemented without the simultaneous introduction of a system of comprehensive social protection for the population. (adding subhead)

Page 48, column one, first full paragraph, only sentence reads: Many options and calculations showed that their real needs were taken into account to the maximum by making the appropriate compensation in a lump sum according to three age categories: up to five years; up to 12 years; and up to 17 years. (changing number)

Page 48, column one, paragraph three, first sentence reads: Here, at least, there is a guarantee that money will be spent according to its purpose, since over 30 percent of goods intended for children used to be acquired at preferential prices by the adult population. Thus, the specific size of compensation payments for the population's individual social and age groups could be as follows:

Population Group	Size of Compensation Per Person (Rubles Per Month)
1. Children aged (in years):	
Up to 5	30
6-12	35
13-17	39
2. Higher educational establishments and day technical and production and technical colleges (above 17 years)	35
3. Workers, employees, collective farm members, and other categories of employees	option I—45 option II—15 percent of salary, but not less than R40
4. Pensioners (nonworking)	35
5. Dependents (excluding children)	20

Targeted compensation in connection with the increased prices of children's goods of R5 for children up to 5, R6 for children between 6 and 12, and R7 a month for children between 13 and 17 years of age has been included.

If the Supreme Soviet backs the government's proposal on the change in retail prices for bread and bread products from July this year, then the corresponding portion of compensation will be paid simultaneously from the moment the price increases are brought in. (adding table and rewording)

Page 48, column two, paragraph four, last sentence reads: Every citizen of the country should express his attitude to it.

Increasing the Motivation for Highly Productive, High-Quality Labor, Remuneration, and Employment

Comrades, the emergence of a fully fledged all-Union market brings to the forefront the demand for effective employment under which the individual's attitude to work is radically changed, and his responsibility for its results increases. (adding subhead and rewording)

Page 49, column two, fifth paragraph, last sentence reads: It is important to create the conditions for every citizen to be freely able, by his own choice, to acquire an apartment or a house, including by means of mortgage, period hire, or leasing.

Economic Relations Between the USSR and the Republics

Comrade deputies, we are all witnesses of the complicated and complex processes going on in the Soviet Federation. (adding subhead)

Page 50, column two, paragraph three, last sentence reads: The granting of economically favorable taxation to them, the financing of credit, the application of other market regulators in the transition stage, the granting of special conditions stipulated in formal agreements, of

participation of individual republics in the implementation of all-union and regional programs, and finally, the creation of a special regional development fund which could be formed on the basis of equal percentage deductions from the national income produced by the union republics and which could be used according to the joint decisions of the union and republican governments.

On the Development of Market Relations and the Material Balance of the National Economy in the Transitional Period

Comrade deputies! Allow me now to examine the process of transition to a regulated market economy from another viewpoint, namely the material balance of the national economy and its most important sectors. (adding subheads)

Page 52, column one, third full paragraph, first sentence reads: The essence of the third option is that the state order is established for a limited range of some of the most important products in a quantity necessary for certain aims. (rewording)

Page 52, column two, third paragraph, first sentence reads: However, all our experience shows that even at a time when everything was distributed in a centralized way, it was never possible to provide 100 percent of materials. (rewording)

Page 52, column two, paragraph five, last sentence reads: The government believes that the entire existing system of providing supplies and equipment must, without delay, join in resolving this task and by its mediatory activity, help enterprises build bridges of new cooperation.

The Investment Complex Under the Conditions of Market Relations

A special role in the transition period will be played by the normalization of the situation in the investment sphere. (adding subhead)

Page 53, column two, second full paragraph, only sentence reads: And there must be such support, including the development of the basis of the building industry and of building materials.

Comrades!

Market relations need to be developed in the scientific and technical sphere too.

Above all, they must cover applied research and development which results in the assimilation of new equipment and technology in production. The most general form of the organization of scientific and technical activity will be economically accountable contracts, and the results of developments will be sold as goods. Market competition will undoubtedly encourage scientific and technical progress in the country.

As for basic research, it will continue to be patronized by the state, and its main source of finance will continue to be appropriations from union and republic budgets.

The Agro-Industrial Complex Under the Conditions of Market Relations

Comrades! There is no need to speak of how important the solution of the food problem is for us. (adding passage and subhead)

Page 54, column two, first full paragraph, first sentence reads: The government believes that in a market economy, substantial changes will also occur in the relationship between the producers of foodstuffs and the consumer.

According to forecasts, the following changes in the market for foodstuffs in 1991 are very likely (figures as a percentage of the total) [In the following table "A" denotes "fixed prices", "B" denotes "free and regulated prices"]:

	1989	(out-turn)	1991	(forecast)
	A	B	A	B
Foodstuffs sold directly through the state and cooperative trade network, total	92	8	60	40
Livestock products	88	12	75	25
Vegetable products	95	5	47	53
Fish products	98	2	70	30

Substantial changes are also planned in the actual system for creating food resources. (adding table)

Page 54, column two, third full paragraph, sentence one reads: This alternative has been chosen: to guarantee the satisfaction of state and interregional demands for food and raw materials, it is envisaged that for a transitional period, state orders for the supply of food to the all-union stock will continue to be presented by the government of the USSR only to the union republics. (rewording)

Page 55, column one, first partial paragraph, last sentence reads: Consequently, in order to ensure the supply of food goods to the consumer market, we need to create the essential reserves and food stocks for carrying over, including at the republic level.

The Organization of the Consumer Market

Comrades, the effectiveness of the measures for moving over to a market-type economy will, in the last resort, be evaluated by the level of stabilization and the supply of goods to the consumer market, and also by changes in their quality. (adding subhead)

Page 55, column one, paragraph four, last sentence reads: This is a very important condition which makes it possible to speed up the smoothing out of the unjustified

differences between the consumption and the distribution of the mass of goods throughout the union and autonomous republics, krais, and oblasts.

Guideline calculations have shown that even by 1991 the following changes in the all-union market for nonfood consumer goods are entirely likely (as a percentage of trade turnover) [In the following table the letters denote: A—sales at fixed state prices; B—sales at regulated prices; C—sales at free prices]:

	A	B	C
Light industry goods	60	30	5-10
Cultural, consumer, and economic goods	40	35	25

(adding passage and table)

Page 55, column two, second full paragraph, last sentence reads: The government will constantly monitor the situation coming about here and promptly take the appropriate decisions.

Foreign Economic Ties

Comrades, world experience has shown that the pace of economic development of a country vigorously taking part in world economic ties is considerably higher. (adding subhead)

Page 56, column one, paragraph six, last sentence reads: It is necessary to activate its inflow under mutually-acceptable conditions.

Regulation of the Processes of Expanded Reproduction, Features of the Development of the State Plan for 1991, and the Attitude to the Formation of the 13th Five-Year Plan

Comrades, the economic model, whose formation has begun in the country, has received the name of a regulated economy, a regulated market economy. (adding subhead)

Page 56, column two, paragraph four, sentence four reads: At the same time, to leave the country, especially at the first stage of transition to market relations, without planning and regulation, is also something we cannot do; and therefore, the USSR Council of Ministers, has at the present time, started work on preparing the plan for 1991, and is proposing that next year's draft plan be submitted to the Supreme Soviet. (rewording)

Political & Social

Official Denies Gorbachev To Be Replaced

AU1806140190 Paris AFP in English 1337 GMT
18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 18 (AFP)—A high-ranking Communist Party member said Monday he could see no possibility that Mikhail Gorbachev would not be chosen

to continue as general secretary at the next party congress. Rumours have been circulating in Moscow to the effect that Mr. Gorbachev, faced with increasing nationalist pressures, an economic crisis and even splits within the communist party, would not be re-elected. Central Committee Secretary Andrey Girenko told the press agency NOVOSTI that he did "not think the 28th congress will be oriented towards this type of discussion."

Mr. Gorbachev combines the functions of head of state and Secretary General of the Soviet Communist Party.

The congress, beginning July 2, will examine the party's situation and the problems facing it, "will take decisions on new statutes" and "will define the new leading bodies," Mr. Girenko said. He said rumours that Mr. Gorbachev would be replaced had no foundation. The congress meets every five years to elect a new Central Committee and the general secretary. During the party federal conference in 1988, Mr. Gorbachev successfully defended the principle of combining the roles of head of state and party leader.

At a meeting with Young Communists in April, Mr. Gorbachev said that "for now" the union of the two posts is indispensable. Separating the posts to "satisfy the slogans of no matter who," he said, would create a "double power" and a confrontation between the party and the soviets and the elected assemblies of the Soviet Union.

Girenko Examines Interethnic Problems

LD1806211790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 18 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The special features of the CPSU's nationalities policy was the topic of a meeting between Andrey Nikolayevich Girenko, secretary of the party's Central Committee, and journalists held today in Moscow in the press center of the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian party conference. [video shows press conference in session with Girenko on the platform]

[Correspondent I. Minayev] The problem of interethnic relations, like a forest fire, did not spring up out of the blue but smouldered for a long time in the depths of society and then broke through to the surface. For many years virtually no attention was paid to resolving them.

At the start of the meeting Comrade Girenko made a small foray into history, recalling that after the 12th congress in 1923 problems of interethnic relations were not considered right up until the 19th party conference. The logical question was heard at the meeting: Isn't the CPSU late in resolving them?

[Begin Girenko recording] Over the years of restructuring, when the opportunity opened up to exchange views freely on any issues, the nationality problems

naturally made themselves known, and, perfectly understandably, made themselves known in all their acuteness. The need arises to consider and resolve them, taking account of the current realities of our life. In this regard it is possible to speak about a certain lateness. [end recording]

[Minayev] Life itself has brought to the fore the question of the real sovereignty of the republics and the need to elaborate a new Union treaty. However, as was noted at the meeting, the republics cannot live in isolation from one another. The processes of integration are too deep.

Maybe most of the questions concerned the Russian party conference, which opens tomorrow. One of these was: What influence will the creation of a Russian communist party have on resolving the problems of interethnic relations?

[Begin Girenko recording] I am convinced that the creation of a Russian communist party will facilitate the resolution of problems in the sphere of ethnic relations. [end recording]

Soviet Plane Hijacked From Danube 18 Jun

Headed Toward Turkey

LD1806133190 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Viktor Veprik and Yefim Shvartsman]

[Text] Izmail, Odessa region June 18 TASS—A passenger plane was hijacked from the airport in Izmail, a Soviet city on the Danube, today. The 12-seat single-engine biplane An-2 took off at 9:09 Moscow time and crossed the state border three minutes later.

Odessa KGB officials told TASS that the plane was reported flying in the air space of Romania and Bulgaria and heading toward Turkey.

The identity of the hijacker and details of the incident are being investigated.

Hijacker Identified

LD1906020890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2330 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] On 18 June at 9 o'clock Moscow time an An-2 airplane was hijacked from the city of Izmail of the Odessa Oblast. The hijacker is a former pilot of the Odessa air brigade who was discharged at his own request a few months ago. Three minutes after take-off, the airplane had crossed the Soviet-Romanian border and vanished. A special commission is investigating the details of the incident.

Chilean Magazine Interviews Boris Yeltsin

PY1806224690 Santiago COSAS in Spanish
12 Jun 90 pp 64, 65

["Exclusive" interview with Boris Yeltsin, "Mikhail Gorbachev's main opponent," by Andre Jouffe with the aid of an interpreter in Spain—date not given]

[Text] [Jouffe] If you are elected president of the Russian Federation, what will be your first demands?

[Yeltsin] Perestroika was born as a promise of better times, both in terms of the economy and freedom. Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, has not yet been able to achieve the so-called economic recovery. The Soviet people continue to suffer from deprivation. The old system has become worse because of a strong inflation which the minister cannot control. I think that this government should resign to allow room for another one to offer a better and more feasible plan.

[Jouffe] Chile resumed relations with your country only two months ago. What do you think of this political and diplomatic move?

[Yeltsin] It is very positive and it will benefit the two countries. The fact that I criticize Gorbachev's policy does not mean I oppose everything done by his government. I think that the Soviet Union should maintain relations with the whole world; the policy of sectorial relations is not in keeping with the current times.

[Jouffe] What, in your opinion, has been Gorbachev's greatest mistake?

[Yeltsin] Not having calculated correctly the people's patience. Forty-eight million Soviet people are currently living below the official poverty line; this is more than in 1985, when Gorbachev assumed power.

[Jouffe] Was Gorbachev the real inspiration behind perestroika, or was it the pope or Reagan, as has been said?

[Yeltsin] Gorbachev had something to do with it in the beginning. He aroused great enthusiasm when he talked about positive changes—always in abstract terms. In 1986 we began to lose our illusions as we saw that a real restructuring did not take place and that the alleged perestroika program was only a bluff. The echoes of that useless enthusiasm are still resounding in America and Europe, but the Soviet people returned to their usual distrust for anything that comes from that inseparable pair of clowns: party and government.

[Jouffe] Could a civil war take place in the USSR as a consequence of the shortage problem?

[Yeltsin] A civil war would be disastrous in a nuclear country like ours. The evil monster of the KGB, however, is still playing around, as if its games have not already cost thousands of lives. The Soviet Army, the largest in the world, has also not been reformed.

Although its lower ranks support reform, the top commanders remain inflexible in their senile unmovability. They are part of the apparatus; at any moment, by order of the apparatus, they can be ordered to close ranks and repress the people.

[Jouffe] Has the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution, which established the political monopoly of the Communist Party, been effective or not?

[Yeltsin] The latest card played by the Politburo is a demonstration. First they invited us to hold talks; when the Democratic Platform, which is made up of reforming communists, presented its proposals to the Central Committee, they played this card, reviving the tragic events of our history. They threatened to expel those who favored the Democratic Platform from the party and from their jobs. It was a real witch-hunt. I presented a protest. I think that if the same methods are used in this summer's congress—that is, "for them" and "he who is not with us is against us"—the Democratic Platform will form its own party.

[Jouffe] What is your position on Lithuania?

[Yeltsin] I favor holding a plebiscite on Lithuania. I think that the freedom of a nation should begin with the freedom of each individual. A structure that is valid, in my opinion, begins with freedom of individuality, then with freedom of enterprise, municipal autonomy, and national sovereignty.

[Jouffe] Much has been said of a Europe without borders in 1992. Is it possible for the European Community to attain this goal? How can the intrinsic nationalism of the peoples be eliminated?

[Yeltsin] It is a bit too soon to speak of a Europe without borders while there still are serious nationalistic problems. But man should have an ideal, something to strive for. In my opinion, the common house of Europe, and afterward, the common house of the world, are worthy and attainable goals. Theoreticians divided the world 100 or 200 years ago with their ideologies. Now, to attain unity, we must forget the dogmas.

[Jouffe] How do you intend to implement a government plan without incidents or serious disagreements in the Russian Federation?

[Yeltsin] By creating a coalition government.

[Jouffe] Do you see the USSR as European or Asiatic?

[Yeltsin] You are not talking about geography, right? From the political and economic point of view, we are far away from European levels. We are 280 million poorly supplied citizens without democratic experience. Who will allow us to come into their house?

[Jouffe] Are you not too negative? Haven't you been told that the USSR already has too many enemies abroad for you to create more animosity domestically? Doesn't Gorbachev have any merit for you?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I recognize that it is because of him that I am now able to express myself freely.

[Jouffe] Are the economic problems weakening Gorbachev in his negotiations?

[Yeltsin] Yes, they put him in a remarkably inferior position for a summit meeting.

[Jouffe] Is there a possibility of communism recovering its popularity of past times through elections or as an alternative system?

[Yeltsin] As a pariah and a starving legion, no, I hope never. I am not worried about what the promising future toward which humanity is heading will be called. Let the philosophers label it. The important thing is that it must become a society of free people, without hunger and with clothes to protect themselves from the cold.

[Jouffe] In a visit we paid to Moscow three years ago we did not see that...

[Yeltsin] Moscow is not the Soviet Union.

Miners' Resolution Defying Communist Party

AU1506233690 Paris AFP in English 2018 GMT
15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 15 (AFP)—The congress of miners' strike committees adopted Friday a resolution defying the Soviet Communist Party, according to INTERFAX, a publication of Radio Moscow.

The congress, in session since Monday in the Ukrainian town of Donetsk, declared that "On the eve of the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, there is little serious hope that the party will be able to decisively renew itself, and it is for this reason that we are leaving the party." "We workers do not believe that the Communist Party is the party of the working class," said the resolution, adopted by a vote of 308 to 116 with 17 abstentions.

The delegates demanded "true independence for all workers' organizations of all political orientations, and an end to the privileges of Communist Party representatives and Komsomols (Communist youth) in the mines."

With the arrival of pluralism, said the declaration, "Communist Party property produced by the people should be nationalized" and "equal conditions should be established for all parties' activities."

The congress adopted Wednesday a motion demanding the resignation of the government because of its social and economic policies. The delegates at the congress represent the strike committees which directed the July 1989 miners' strike, which lasted three weeks and kept 200,000 miners out of work.

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress**Medvedev Chairs Preparatory Session***LD1806212690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1708 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—The working group of the commission in charge of preparing the 28th CPSU Congress held its third meeting here today. Vadim Medvedev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, chaired the meeting. A large number of congress delegates who were co-opted into the working group took part. The CPSU Central Committee secretary noted that recommendations given by the previous meeting, and numerous remarks and requests made by delegates to the 28th congress, by party committees, primary party organizations, ordinary communists, and also by representatives of democratic and Marxist platforms of the CPSU, with whom working meetings were held, were considered in the variant of the document "toward humane, democratic socialism," which is being discussed.

Three groups of questions were at the center of attention of those who took part in the discussion: the crisis of society and the party's strategic tasks, the program of party activities, which includes the foremost emergency measures, as well as strategy and tactics for approaching humane and democratic socialism, the role of the party in society and the radical democratization of the party.

The need to analyze more thoroughly both objective and subjective causes for the present situation, the historical roots of the crisis, and the mistakes that have been allowed to occur already in the course of perestroika were stressed.

Issues of the attitude toward different types of property—including state, collective, shareholders', and private property—became the subject for a lively discussion. Particular attention was paid to the reflection in the document of guarantees for realization of social justice and social security for the working people.

The discussion of the ways for radical perestroika in the party revealed rapprochement in the understanding of the principles of party structure, of its functions and work methods. At the same time, it revealed some serious differences of view among representatives of different platforms of the CPSU on these issues.

Precongress Platforms Compared*90UN20584 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Jun 90 p 2*

[Article by A. Masyagin, candidate of historical sciences: "On the Home Stretch"]

[Text] The precongress debate is entering the home stretch, as they say. Indeed, supporters of the "Democratic Platform" will assemble at their conference on 16 June, and the all-Russia party conference will begin on 19 June, and the 28th CPSU Congress, on 2 July. Thus

what was prior to this, the subject of months-long discussion, will become the subject of choice and determination of one's position and, which should be said openly, possible dissociation from one's party comrades.

The theoretical debate prior to the congress has been concentrated mainly around three platforms: that of the CPSU Central Committee under the name of "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism," the "Democratic Platform," which was adopted at an all-Union conference of party clubs and party organizations, and the "Marxist Platform in the CPSU" prepared by the federation of Marxist party clubs. Other programs have been and are being put forward as the debate progresses, but on the whole they modify, perhaps, merely in a different set the same problems which have been raised in the said platforms. Nor are these platforms themselves equivalent, if they are examined from the position of their exposition of the main problems of our social development. From this viewpoint the "Democratic Platform," for example, advances no thoughts concerning policy in the sphere of the economy, social, and national relations....

Reality, meanwhile, is developing rapidly and engendering problems which have been embraced by no platforms, but which no one can ignore. It is a question of a cardinal reform of the economic system, merely the announcement of a step toward it having thoroughly shaken the whole country. It is a question of a split in the camp of those who constitute our agrarian corps, of the problem of how to ensure a diversity of forms of ownership and management in the countryside. Of the official structuring of Russian statehood and the creation of a Russian Communist Party as a factor strengthening or destabilizing our federation as a whole. Of a course geared toward anticommunism proclaimed by some people.

"Give us straight answers to the damned questions"—this appeal is directed currently at the upcoming party congress, the compilers of all the platforms and all the new political formations which are emerging. The answers to these questions will also signify the line of demarcation.

...Granted the many similar positions, proposals, and demands, which are already being realized in the course of preparation for the congress, incidentally, the clearest confrontation is, nonetheless, between the CPSU Central Committee Platform and the "Democratic Platform." And this confrontation, what is more, is primarily on the question of the role which should be performed by the party in society, the kind of party it should be in principle, and how the party should be reformed.

Discussion of the differences between the CPSU Central Committee Platform and the "Democratic Platform" is facilitated to a large extent thanks to an interview given the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY (No. 21) by V. Lysenko, member of the "Democratic Platform" Coordinating Council. In it the interviewee tried to specify

the main demands on a reform of the party in order, as he maintains, to escape its "totalitarian character." And hereupon warned (or "threatened")—in the spirit of the "democratism" which he professes, evidently—that if these demands are not adopted, the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" will walk out of the congress.

To judge by his unconditional formulation of the issue, V. Lysenko does not allow that the delegates could accept one part of the demands, and not another; that compromise could be reached on this question or the other; that a number of demands, having undergone "wording" changes, possibly, would be accepted and so forth. Only after its decisions can it be said how a communist will act and what choice will be made, for the questions dividing the two platforms hardly have unambiguous simple solutions.

So, problem number one: V. Lysenko demands "the abandonment of communism as the goal of the CPSU and a corresponding change in the party's name." It should be said that the CPSU has learned bitter lessons from the era of Stalinism and the periods of voluntarism and stagnation and is setting as its immediate goal the building of a society of humane and democratic socialism. Demanding of the millions of communists abandonment of the communist perspective in principle, as, equally, abandonment of the name of the party, which it has to be assumed the majority of them joined consciously, cannot be done without an all-party referendum. This is not only my viewpoint. Such problems cannot be solved by a stroke of the pen or the proclamation of a resounding slogan, even if evoked by the prevailing motifs. In addition, it is difficult for the party now—there is no end to the charges against it—fair and unfair. Quaking and hoisting at this time the white flag would mean inflicting on the party irreparable political losses. And on society also. Even a child would see that a change of name was an attempt to evade the historical responsibility which has fallen to the lot of the CPSU.

It is logical, in its way, that the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" go on to demand "elimination of the monopoly of one ideology." What is most likely meant is Marxism-Leninism. The position of the CPSU Central Committee Platform is not as one-sided as might be imagined from the demand which is made. Only a blind man could fail to spot that since the start of perestroika the CPSU Central Committee has in fact been pursuing a policy geared to the abandonment of monopoly in any sphere of life, ideology included. That long-standing habits and stereotypes formed over decades will, evidently, whether we like it or not, make their presence felt for a long time to come is another matter.

The CPSU Central Committee Platform holds to the position that when formulating policy it is necessary to proceed from all that is progressive that has been accumulated by world socialist thought, including, as a matter of fact, the fundamental contribution of Marx,

Engels, and Lenin; and from all that is valuable that has been accumulated by mankind. There is no hint of ideological monopoly here.

Very many lances, regardless, frequently, of platforms even, are being broken around the principle of democratic centralism. Many people see democratic centralism as the whole trouble and the root of all the deformations which have occurred in the CPSU and for this reason reject it root and branch. The CPSU Central Committee Platform sees as the reasons for the deformation Stalinism and the all-embracing administrative-command system which it created, when all rules of party life and the principles of leadership were distorted or existed in purely formal form. As far as democratic centralism is concerned, it has manifestly become bureaucratic centralism.

Today the question of democratic centralism is frequently being decided quite subjectively: We will replace it, and that is that. Yet there is to this principle an objective truth, an objective necessity. Matters cannot be portrayed such as to indicate that this principle was born accidentally, one fine day, at a moment of illumination of some outstanding personality. Democratic centralism, correctly employed, represents an organic combination on a permanent basis of democracy and discipline, autonomy and centralism. And behind the formulation of these principles are centuries of human history. In her time R. Luxemburg saw in the practice of democratic centralism which had taken shape in the Bolshevik Party features of an "ultra-centralist" organization. Replying to her, V.I. Lenin emphasized that this principle reflects the "elementary propositions of any conceivable party organization." As we can see, this argument has not yet abated.

It is now frequently proposed, by the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" included, that democratic centralism be called or replaced with "democratic unity" or, simply, "democratic principles." This is all, it would seem, an attempt in words to evade the essence of the phenomenon. And the essence is, for all that, as follows: The CPSU, an almost 19 million-strong party, with a relatively complex structure and operating over vast expanses in an exceptionally multinational country with specific features which are unique from area to area, would hardly exist as some common entity without definite foundations of discipline and centralism. The "Democratic Platform" shuns the concept of "discipline" like the devil shuns incense. But the communist masses should hardly do so. Nor, incidentally, should any association, if it intends influencing reality and society.

V. Lysenko demands in his interview that the CPSU abandon unitarism in favor of the federalization of the party, which, in his view, would also contribute to the elimination of totalitarianism in the CPSU. I would like to say plainly: Such a formulation of the issue is simply incorrect. It is not even a question of a major break with the past here also and of parties not necessarily being

built along the same power lines as the state which is being proposed. The point is that this matter is too delicate for anyone to be able to dictate from outside how it should be resolved. This question, more than any other, is wholly within the province of the sovereignty of the congress. It is known, for example, that the Moldavian Communist Party Congress, the Conference of Communists of the Donbass, and others have espoused the unitary nature of CPSU. But the main thing, in our view, lies elsewhere. Whether the CPSU is unitary or federal, it will not for all that, in our view, be possible to say of it that it has become more or less democratic. We are dealing here with phenomena of quite a different order. The victory of democracy will be the extent to which each Communist Party adopts the decision on the kind of party the CPSU should be freely, independently, and self-sufficiently.

A considerable difference between the CPSU Central Committee Platform and the "Democratic Platform" amounts to the kind of role in society they assign the parties. The first proceeds from the fact that the party should aspire to exercise a vanguard role in it. The second, from the fact that party should be primarily a parliamentary force. Both platforms here assert the need for a fundamental democratization of the life and activity of the party and see the essence of this, in agreement with V.I. Lenin, in the establishment of "the power of the party masses."

The CPSU does not intend to establish its vanguard role unilaterally, by a voluntarist proclamation of such, as if once again laying claim to the place of sole leader of society. By no means—this is unequivocal. While not denying the significance of parliamentary work, the party at the same time sees as its purpose maximally effective service of the people by the entire immense ideological and organizational potential of its 19 million-strong Army, and not only at the time of an election struggle but permanently and universally, and each communist doing in his location the maximum possible for the cardinal transformation of society on the paths of freedom, democracy, and consistent humanism. And the party intends to act, furthermore, not in isolation but together with all political forces that aspire to the same goal as it.

The "Democratic Platform" maintains that the party should acquire the right to political leadership exclusively at elections. The party "works" to promote its representatives to the soviets. Those elected deputies from the party will "express the wishes of their electorate, not superior party authorities." Leaving aside the question of the legitimacy of the permanent counterpoise between the electorate and the party authorities, we would note merely that the "authority of the party masses" ends at the threshold of the soviets. The communists elected to them become autonomous in their actions, which, incidentally, is not permitted even by bourgeois parties in respect of their representatives in parliament.

The differing approach to the question of the party's role in society is leading, naturally, to a demarcation on many issues concerning the ways and methods of democratization of the life of the party.

Thus all parties to the debate recognize the need for the party to be converted into a real political organization, which is characterized by a rich political life, free debate, and the participation of the communist masses in the adoption of the most important political decisions. It is proposed for this to guarantee in statutory fashion pluralism of opinions, freedom of criticism, a diversity of approaches and platforms, the holding of referendums, and the right of the minority to defend its views. But then the differences begin. The supporters of the "Democratic Platform" demand the right to the formation of factions with the possibility of their organizational exclusiveness and they see this as a guarantee of genuine democracy in the party. The CPSU Central Committee Platform does not consider this formulation of the issue correct since factions, as experience shows, gradually begin to live their own life, are guided in all things only by the logic of struggle, and naturally destroy party comradeship, which should make the party particularly strong.

Questions of the composition of the party (the production or territorial principle or a combination of them; the significance of horizontal structures) are being actively discussed in the debate, but, it would seem, common solutions could be found here.

In our view it is very important here not to be led around by the exponents of pseudo-democratic populist views, which are almost always mixed with organized distrust of the executive authorities and the party apparatus and which proceed from the fact that all may be changed for the better except the executive structures. It is for this reason, for example, that they propose that the rayon party committees be replaced by territorial structures. To anyone acquainted with the entire complexity of ensuring the interconnection of party organizations such a formulation of the issue will seem—and quite legitimately, in my opinion—unserious.

Generally, innovations in party work are good but, as in any other sphere of social life, they require preliminary expert appraisal and verification. Otherwise, as shown by many examples from our economic and state life, we will have unpredictable results.

Many participants in the all-party debate, for example, declared that only elections by party district, in which all primary party organizations would participate, would provide a real surge of intraparty democracy. This was done. Yet practice is proving far more conservative than anticipated. The elections of delegates to the congress are not yet completed, but the preliminary results show that unfortunately many executives and party officials have been elected so far (they are, after all, more familiar to the large circle of party organizations united by the party district), and few workers and peasants (up to 15 percent

only). So proposals concerning the introduction of some quotas for this category of communists are seriously being expressed for the future. In any event the 28th congress will have to impartially evaluate the new system of elections in the CPSU and express its findings.

The present generations of Soviet communists have never before participated in such profound political debate on the eve of a congress. Let us hope that this is reflected in the depth, balance, and comprehensiveness of the decisions and the entire work of the 28th congress which, whether we like it or not, will to a large extent determine the fate of the party and its path into the future.

Consolidation Discussed

PM1306153590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 5, 6

[V. Kerimov and V. Naumov account of "Editorial Office 'Roundtable' Discussion" as part of "Discussion Pamphlet No. 45" feature under the general heading "The Party and Perestroika. In Preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress": "Is Consolidation Still Possible"—date of discussion not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] We offer our readers material from a debate on "The Marxist Platform in the CPSU" which was held in our editorial office. Representatives of various political streams, social scientists, and PRAVDA staffers took part in the discussion.

A. Ilin, deputy chief editor of PRAVDA: Our readers are familiar with the "Marxist Platform in the CPSU," it was published. I could also mention a series of other publications on this topic, specifically the discussion "How Many Platforms Do Marxists Need?" Among the material carried by other newspapers, it is worth noting A. Butenko's article "Crisis or Deadlock" in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA.

Evidently, the time when it was primarily necessary to identify differences between platforms and contrast them has already passed. Today's task is different. Very little time remains until the congress and, proceeding from the interests of society's and the party's perestroika, there is probably nothing that is more important than determining common approaches—at least as regards the main and fundamental positions. This would make it possible to move forward together. If different platforms are submitted to the congress, it will be very difficult to thoroughly analyze them all and elaborate common program documents in the few days while it is at work. And if the party divides along different programs in the process, the congress will hardly live up to the expectations of communists in their millions. This is why we would like our "roundtable" to try and define the main element in the "Marxist Platform" which could be taken as a constructive base for preparing the congress documents.

Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Buzgalin, member of the "Marxist Platform in the CPSU" Coordinating Council: The draft "Marxist Platform" with which readers are familiar was further elaborated taking into account the remarks expressed at the party clubs conference in Bykovo. We added a stipulation that we advocate the revival and dialectical development of the theory of Marx and Lenin, a critical attitude toward our forerunners like the one Lenin adopted toward Marx. Marxism, like any other science, demands permanent revolutionization of its theoretical base in line with the changing world.

It offers an analysis of our society's crisis, whose essence lies in the fact that the totalitarian bureaucratic system and its inherent forms and methods lead to man's alienation from the means of production and society's structures. The result is a gigantic waste of human, natural, and material resources, economic stagnation, and a trend toward spiritual degradation. The system undermines man as the main productive force, and hence the inevitability of the crisis.

We tried to be more specific as to whom we perceive as our mainstay. These are primarily the section of working people—primarily from the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia—who are unable to solve their material and social problems unless the life of society as a whole is improved. People who aim for free collective labor. It seems to me that they can indeed provide a direct social base for the "Marxist Platform." The nationalities question is more precisely formulated and, specifically, emphasis is placed on the lumpen elements as one of the components of nationalist and chauvinist movements. These movements have both separatist and great-power leanings, and in many cases rely on corrupt bureaucracies, shadow economy wheeler-dealers, and so on.

Political tasks are more precisely formulated. We arrived at the conclusion that the political system of socialism includes but is not limited to a multiparty system and parliamentary democracy, it rather relies on real self-management from below.

The following proposal is given pride of place in the economic section. Scientific and technical progress has set the task of overcoming all forms of workers' alienation from the means of production, of emancipating their creative initiative. For this purpose, we believe that it is necessary to transform state property into all-people's property. Private property and hired labor could be used during the transitional period subject to state monitoring and provided working people's social security is guaranteed.

The rationing system thesis was not very successful in the draft platform. It appeared as if we were advocating it. In actual fact, we are in favor of rejecting all forms of controlled [zakrytoye] distribution of goods. A stage-by-stage rejection, of course, since it is unfortunately impossible to achieve this immediately.

V. Poshtayev, member of the editorial collegium and PRAVDA Ideology Desk editor: On the subject of the deployment of political forces. It seems to me that you, just like the entire platform, are somewhat oversimplifying matters. You proceed from a theory rather than from an actual analysis of processes in society and in life. What material did you use when amplifying them?

M. Malyutin, member of the "Democratic Platform" Coordinating Council: And how do you know what processes occur in real life?

V. Poshtayev: I proceed from an analysis of PRAVDA's mailbag. The ideology desk alone receives about 3,000 letter each month. This offers an opportunity to study the state of affairs.

A. Buzgalin: The platform singles out the following forces: A bourgeois-democratic trend, a social democratic movement which shares illusions of restoring the past model of socialism, a conservative bureaucratic stream, and national movements. On what basis did we do this? Proceeding from a theoretical analysis of our society's social structure. It seems to me that a sizeable proportion of real political movements today are taking shape along these main avenues. We probably already have about a dozen liberal-bourgeois parties. East Europe's experience has shown that they very swiftly evolve into powerful and influential movements. We already have a social democratic movement. The "Democratic Platform" does not say so outright but, with minor exceptions, it is really very close to a social democratic position.

B. Slavin, chief of department at the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute: I am in favor of consolidation of all socialist forces on a principled basis and I think that documents like the "Marxist Platform in the CPSU" and the "Democratic Platform" in parts provide a basis which could bring us to the elaboration of a joint document at the congress.

A. Buzgalin: We are not against the elaboration of such a document either, especially if we were to be invited to take part in its elaboration.

A. Ilin: It can be said that our discussion today contains a certain element of such an invitation.

B. Slavin: I would single out three main paths which our society could take.

If we were to turn right, figuratively speaking, we would return to surviving elements of the totalitarian system which existed in our country in Stalin's times. There are powerful trends pushing in this direction. I think that, as our economic situation deteriorates, they will gather strength beneath the slogan of order, a return of the "iron hand," and so on. Another path, if we were to turn to the left, would lead to leftwing radicalism. This trend is also gathering strength now and is sufficiently strongly represented in the press and the mass media, this trend is

associated with the so-called liberal-bourgeois degeneration of our society. There is even a litmus test which "reveals" the supporters of this trend. They speak of normal civilized society without revealing its class nature. And finally the third path which, in my view, is the most promising. It can really around itself all the main socialist forces—it is trend associated with revealing the socialist society's democratic and humanitarian potential. Generally, it is very important to define the period in which we are living. Both rightwing and leftwing forces today agree that there is no socialism in our country, that we are still in the transitional period.

There are, generally speaking, two transitional periods—from capitalism to socialism and socialism to capitalism. Some theoreticians today say that ours is a transitional period of the second kind, others say that it is of the first kind. Clarity must be introduced here. If we were to reject the idea that we actually have socialism, what is it that we are restructuring?

M. Malyutin: What criteria do you apply to claim that socialism exists in the USSR?

B. Slavin: Here are the criteria: Power in the hands of the working class, public ownership, absence of exploitation. It is a different matter that these principles have been deformed in our country. But this does not mean that there is nothing associated with socialism in our country. Lenin perceived a socialist structure right after the revolution and associated the future of socialism with it.

One can clearly trace two opposite lines of development in our history, associated with the Leninist and the Stalinist traditions. They frequently clashed with one another. The first blow that Stalin dealt against socialism was the blow against the Leninist guard. The Leninist tradition was not killed off, it can be traced in the vote at the 17th party congress, in the years of the thaw, and now, in the conditions of perestroika. I am convinced: The future is on its side.

M. Malyutin: When we talk about the prospects of our society's development, a return to totalitarianism nonetheless appears improbable, today it is impossible to have a society organized like a vast factory. But in my view the main point is to ask ourselves: What are we planning to reform? Way back in the early twenties, Lenin wrote that state capitalism at the time was a huge step forward in social development. This is also true as regards our society today, the trends toward petty bourgeois development or totalitarian statization.

And antitotalitarian revolution is a boon, and that which happened in East Europe is a lesson for us. The elimination of totalitarianism—even if it does not lead to the establishment of power by the working people—undoubtedly represent social progress and certainly not bourgeois-liberal degeneration, as some people at times claim in our country.

A. Ilin: Would you not be embarrassed if a revolution resorts to totalitarian and antidemocratic means to

attain its goals? Especially as regards members of the former ruling communist parties.

M. Malyutin: I am certainly not a fan of the regimes which have established themselves in East Europe today. But when compared with the excesses that accompanied the previous revolutions, which called themselves socialist, and with what happened in East European countries, there is certainly a difference. It is no accident that they called themselves velvet revolutions.

Frankly speaking, I am not too worried about the future of so-called communist parties in East Europe, they have got what they deserved. Bearing in mind the methods they used to remain in power, it can be said that in the overwhelming majority of cases they were treated in a relatively humane manner, even though the misfortune of any revolution is the fact that, as a rule, the ones to suffer are not the real culprits but anyone that happens to be conveniently to hand. In this context, I am more worried by something else: The collapse, or at least the failure of independent leftwing streams in these countries and the success of liberal-bourgeois and even more conservative streams. Does this not lie in store for us as well?

I would not fully agree with A. Buzgalin that liberal-bourgeois forces in our country could become as influential as in East European countries. From our point of view, there is no chance of this happening. The liberals are struggling for a comparatively narrow social "strip," for the so-called middle stratum which, in our country, is very distinctly different from the middle strata to be found in the West. The Western middle strata are primarily products of production, while our middle strata are the product of the distributive and redistributive system. They think that a certain level of consumption can be guaranteed with help from a free market, pluralism of forms of ownership (including private), a multiparty system, and a rule-of-law state. This orientation toward consumption standards rather than toward production curbs their prospects. And the leftwing forces—to the extent that they exist and to the extent that they claim to be leftwing—should define their stance in this specific situation. A. Buzgalin believes that the "Marxist Platform" must be imbedded at that section of working people who cannot resolve their problems without a change in society's situation.

The idea that public is better than private is dead and buried, and it is hardly likely that this idea could be successfully revived. I am therefore absolutely certain of this: The ones that are first to grasp the real interests will become genuine rather than Mickey Mouse parties. But who is there to appeal to today? First, the technocrats constitute a real force. It has yet to make its presence felt in politics. But there is no doubt that it will do so. As ministries lose their power, as the party leadership—in its past forms, of course—loses power, it will be mainly these people who will profit from any economic transformations, no matter what these transformations might be called. This, figuratively speaking, could be dubbed

the economic progress bloc. Of course, another bloc is also taking shape—the social protection bloc, an example of whose actions was provided by workers' strike committees. It is thus evident that our future political dynamism will be determined by the struggle and interaction between the economic progress bloc and the social protection bloc.

I would make so bold as to voice a seditious thought: By next fall, the CPSU's internal problems will be as much of a worry to our society as Afghanistan's domestic problems are now. In other words, this organization will still be clarifying mutual relations between platforms and streams, there will be a very active discussion of who will retain what proportion of party property, how relations will be built between the center—which will inevitably remain in existence—and republican communist parties to the extent that they will still exist by that time, but all this will hardly be of any concern to anyone.

A. Ilin: As regards forecasts about the CPSU's future, this danger really exists. But it must be borne in mind that the party is the real political force on which a lot in our society depends, and if it were to shift to the periphery of public attention and the political arena, there would be no way of telling what the outcome would be. This must be pondered by all, regardless of platforms...

I. Malyarov, member of the USSR United Front of Working people Coordinating Council: I think that the "Marxist Platform" deserves credit for offering a specific path for society's democratization. I mean the development of self-management. Moreover, a self-management which is not restricted to the level of individual enterprises but extends to the level of society. Strictly speaking, self-management organs must hire not only enterprise administrations but also, say, the leadership of concerns and ministries, of various higher-ranking organs. This is a principled element, a principled theoretical breakthrough. But the ideas of self-management clash with the recognition of the possibility of selling enterprises off into private hands, and it seems to me that today this is not a path in line with Marxist ideology.

It seems to me that the "Marxist Platform" lacks a social-class analysis of the demands by national movements. This does not mean rejection of the principle of self-determination. What it means is this: Consistent implementation of this principle from the viewpoint of the aspiration of what really are the people's masses. I would advocate the separation of the Baltic republics if communist forces were in power there. But since pro-bourgeois forces are in power there, I am against these republics' separation.

And one last political question. The idea of democratization is still insufficiently clearly outlined. I agree that the parliamentary system is better than a dictatorship. But I also agree that socialism is not limited to the parliamentary system. It seems to me, incidentally, that

what we elected both this year and last year were not soviets of people's deputies. What we elected was a typical parliament and typical municipal councils—and naturally we received what we deserved. On the one hand, victory by representatives of the elite academic intelligentsia and officials from the mass media in the center. On the other hand, victory by first secretaries and major economic leaders in the provinces. Some people try to present this as follows: Conservative forces win in the provinces, democratic ones in the center. I think that victory goes to those forces which have greater organizational and financial potential, better access to the mass media.

Marxist analysis demands a critique of the parliamentary system. And the country's arrival at a system of soviets, whose motherland our country is. And the last point. The CPSU's future today depends on whether it will succeed in capturing the initiative, in working to anticipate a situation whereby conditions will soon become ripe for a mass leftwing movement by working people. It is still unprepared for this at present. In order to implement a united leftwing program, the Communist Party will have to part company with supporters of rightwing, in other words liberal-bourgeois paths of development. Otherwise a different party will simply evolve within it.

And one more point. An idea is often promoted that corruption is incompatible with the economy's large-scale privatization. In my view, however, they are actually quite compatible and our country can offer an example of the perfectly implemented merger of the state and economic apparatus and our new private owners.

We support all proposals aimed at the party's democratization. Unfortunately, within the framework of universal pluralism of opinions, we lack sufficient opportunities to express our position like, for example, the supporters of the Democratic or the Marxist Platforms. Suffice it to say that the Working Man's Platform was published only by the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY STROITEL [Moscow Construction Worker] with a print run of only 25,000 copies. It would be very, very useful if our position were to be somehow reflected in PRAVDA.

O. Ananin, USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute: It seems to me that today we are quite likely to see a development of events along the line of galvanization of technocrats on the one hand, and of corresponding reaction by the workers' movement on the other hand. But the time periods which M. Malyutin mentioned here are, in my view, not very realistic. We can observe in our country the inertia of the broad masses of working people and of society's various strata. It is for this reason that the party has a chance of continuing to play an active and positive role in politics, provided it does not consolidate itself around the conservative forces within it.

I think that party members who voted for candidates to the 28th CPSU Congress had to make a choice only between the official draft and the "Democratic Platform." The "Marxist Platform" was somewhat late in coming. And the two first documents do not offer real alternatives for the political development of society and the party. They are both compromise documents. As regards the CPSU Central Committee draft, it is a compromise by its very nature. But why did the "Democratic Platform" simply evade taking a principled stance on many questions? In this regard, the "Marxist Platform" enjoys certain advantages—it is not aimed at the entire party. And yet the two other documents—the Democratic Platform and the Central Committee Platform alike—are aimed at the entire party, at rallying all progressive forces as it were. But who is openly taking the conservative forces' side? Everyone is after the progressives.

M. Malyutin: The Democratic Platform is not aimed at everyone, either. It bluntly indicates the ones with whom there will be no consolidation.

O. Ananin: In principle, the party is now facing a dual task. First, it must have its own image, its own special policy. Second, it bears responsibility for society as a whole, in other words it must rally the broad democratic strata. Therefore, the party needs a document which would be aimed at society and to which other political forces could subscribe. I think that it is in this sense that the Central Committee Platform offers certain guidelines.

A certain segment of the party and its leader, who know what they want, have now taken a clear stance within the party. In my view, however, the party masses have largely still not taken a stance. We have had too many passive communists in the party, but the situation is different now. A proportion of this passive mass will be politicized, and I think that this process is already under way. The struggle must be waged over this proportion. And this struggle must, to the extent possible, be also waged within the party. Provided this is helped by the existence of platforms and even factions, this must be done. I think that the "Marxist Platform" is actually on the right path here—it addresses this task, it is aimed at certain part of the party mass, it expresses a certain internal party stance.

But as regards the ideological content of the "Marxist Platform," I think that a series of complaints can be presented. It is essentially saying that the old theoretical constructions should be applied to the present situation. It is impossible to write programs while ignoring the worldwide prospects of public, social, economic, and ecological development. The "Marxist Platform" contains a weak socioeconomic program. One can sense a defensive stance as regards the market. We could tolerate this, it says, but would actually like to make it conditional on this, that, and the other. And there is a total lack of comprehension of the tenet—of fundamental importance for Marxism and the theory of socialism—

that the market is not some force that is hostile to socialism. A struggle must be waged for the market today while, of course, making provisions for social security. We have a chance of acquiring a barbarian market, but the struggle for a civilized market must proceed from a comprehension of the fact that certain difficult stages here are unavoidable.

V. Poshatayev: It seems to me that a very important idea ran through the discussion—the need to consolidate all political forces standing on positions of democratic and humane socialism. The experience of East European countries, where there was no consolidation of leftwing forces and they suffered a tangible political defeat, should be a lesson for us. There is one point that amazes me. Almost all speakers today called for parting of the ways—both ideologically and organizationally—and for consolidation only on a basis of principle. But when the selfsame call is made by the CPSU Central Committee in the familiar letter, this is perceived by many as an antidemocratic action, an attempt to stifle dissidence. Is this not a dual approach toward the parting of the ways?

A. Fadeyev, shop chief at the Machine Building Scientific Research Institute: I am a supporter of the "Marxist Platform." It was the one I liked best—as a communist and a citizen—of all the congress documents I have read. It is disappointing that it is so little known. Back in the past, we distributed through primary party organizations sundry so to say official party documents. And now party committees ask themselves: What is there for us to do in the new conditions? It seems to me that they should inform communists about all the platforms. Without fear that some platform or other might gain preference. Consequently, now we have no supporters of either the "official" CPSU Central Committee platform, or the Marxist, or the Democratic—at least not clearly declared ones.

And now about the passiveness of communists. On the one hand, it is truly shocking. But on the other hand, I would not say that communists are indifferent toward what is happening in the party and in the country. There are simply no clear-cut ideals and slogans in the positive sense. I personally come from the working class, I live in the midst of the working class, and I realize that your serious documents, no matter how good and correct they may be, will never get through to the workers. You have to sit down and spend several hours comparing and working things out.

It seems to me that there must be a more accurate definition of the social base. We could of course try and take under our wings (speaking as a supporters of the "Marxist Platform") all the working people, but I am afraid that nothing would come out of this today. There will be a multiparty system, various social strata will be represented by their parties—there is probably nothing frightening in this. This is a normal process which we all seem to be striving for. At least in words. The question is: How actively will the masses follow us?

A. Buzgalin: We primarily strove to single out a social base, a rather narrow one, aiming at sufficiently consistent movement along the path of the socialist choice and the communist future. Today we do not have many working people capable of unsponsored activity, self-organization, and collective social creativity. We have lost sight of the fact that the promotion of vivid ideas, which would express the interest of the majority of the population and be supported by them, is mandatory at the initial stage. Regardless of how consistently socialist these interests and ideas may be. This is the bloc of ideas which we proposed to promote within the framework of the consolidation of leftwing democratic forces.

A. Fadeyev: I would like to see a clear-cut stance regarding young people in your platform. It is, of course, going to extremes when the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] is a millions-strong organization and everything hinges on it. But something else is also bad—when we forget all about the Komsomol.

A. Buzgalin: We believe that it is primarily necessary to create conditions for the self-organization of youth movements. Unfortunately, it is often petty bourgeois and consumerist trends that prevail in them today. Unless we give them an opportunity to organize themselves, these trends will gain the upper hand.

A. Fadeyev: It seems to me that you are nonetheless detached from the environment for whose sake you waste ink and break lances. Of course, when mixing with the people and ordinary communists, it is painful to listen to complaints and reproaches, but these are real people, this is how they think and how they live, and they make their choice not the way we wish or prescribe on paper but on the basis of how they themselves perceive the situation, of how they think and live, worrying about their own problems. But I can see that there are no volunteers to "dive" deep in the thick of it.

A. Ilin: It seems to me that the last statement expressed one of the most substantial reasons why people are confused and the party is losing its prestige. Evidently, not a single one of the platform presented for selection, as it were, seriously addresses the real interests of people its wants to attract and lead. A. Kolganov from the "Marxist Platform" spoke at the verbal issue of the "Debating Pamphlet" during the PRAVDA festival at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements, and said specifically: "We will part company with such people, we have nothing to do with them..." You see, it is very easy to part company with people, to cast everyone aside and, galloping ahead on a white charger, to prance about and admire yourself. But it is still necessary to think for whom we are building various platforms, whose plans and goals we are formulating. We must, first, listen to what the people want and understand them. Maybe then we can answer the question about which principles to uphold, which ideas will work and which will not. It seems to me that this is the weak aspect of the "Marxist Platform."

If we succeeded in consolidating—as it is fashionable to say now—the forces of the party and the entire society and organizing the elaboration of decisions which would be accepted by the people, which the people could check—and check successfully—against their own experience, it seems to me that then we would be able to score a real success. This is the main point.

Second CPSU-Marxist Platform Meeting Held

Opens 16 Jun

LD1606215290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1930 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] The Second All-Union Conference of Supporters of the CPSU Marxist Platform opened in Moscow on 16 June. Those participating in it—representatives of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and Estonia—will discuss the draft CPSU rules, and will bring to the congress their own thoughts on how to add to them.

The agenda for the work of the conference includes the tasks of further developing the movement and drafting proposals aimed at getting the country out of its critical situation.

Supporters Meet

LD1806194890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1800 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] An all-union conference of the movement of Marxist platform supporters in the CPSU has been held in the capital. Taking part in it were about a hundred delegates and 200 guests from 70 towns in the Soviet Union. The conference examined and adopted a proposal for an anticrisis program that includes measures in the economic-political sphere for the stabilization of the situation in the country. In particular, in the economic sphere, it is proposed to stage a price reform without a general price increase and the subsequent tough control over prices, monetary reform, progressive taxes on inheritance, and other measures.

A resolution on a draft rules of the CPSU was adopted at the conference. Among other things, it proposes to strengthen the collectiveness of the leadership, to convene a party congress annually, and so on. A resolution on specific political problems also was adopted.

Parliamentary Republic System Viewed

WA1406174890 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 24, 13 Jun 90 p 1

[Article under the rubric "Chief Editor's Column": "Parliamentary Republic"]

[Text] The first steps of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]—the election of B.N. Yeltsin as chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the Declaration of

Russian Sovereignty—have created a new situation in our political life. We must consider this situation calmly and sensibly in order to make correct decisions which will be to the benefit of our people and our country. It is impossible to imagine that Russia, in the person of its highest organ, will begin a struggle with the Union in which it has been and will remain the largest of the units forming the system. On the contrary, I am convinced that M.S. Gorbachev, the president of our country, and B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, will find a common language and that the whole political tendency will move in the direction of needed structural reforms.

Often one must hear dissatisfaction with the fact that the process of forming the new power is proceeding so slowly and painfully. In the meantime production is falling, the stores are getting emptier, and life is getting more expensive. The political horse trudges along slowly, hindering the movement of the economic cart.

What can hasten the process of our development? Which idea, which platform can unite people and avert society's splitting into quarreling groups, nations, and regions?

The idea and the five-year practice of democratization have played a huge role in the reconstruction of our political system. But now this idea must take on a more concrete form. And this form is the fact that democratization encompasses not just diverse but even directly opposing forces and currents. It seemed that democracy should lead to greater patience, to sensible compromises, to universal regard for interests and opinions, and to civilized forms of political competition. But in the meantime something quite the opposite is taking place. Bitterness and tension grow from day to day. And the various forces are frequently prepared to devour one another in a mutual struggle. We watch as two basic groups at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies block one another, dragging out the formation of administrative institutions and the transition to practical decisions.

Our public opinion is discussing a number of important constructive projects for completing political reform. It is appropriate here to mention the testament of A.D. Sakharov, who presented his own model for a future Constitution. I would like as a matter for discussion to focus attention on an idea which seems to me most important now. It is the idea of a parliamentary republic—from the bottom to the top. Properly speaking, the process of forming it is already underway. We only need to acknowledge reality and move more consistently along this path.

A parliamentary republic is national sovereignty, the leadership of publicly elected parliamentary institutes, a division of powers, a multiparty system, the guarantee of inalienable rights and personal freedoms, legality and a legal system, compromises and honest competition, and respect for the rights of minorities.

Aristotle noted 2,000 years ago that unorganized democracy easily becomes the power of numbers and then mob rule, and the latter turns into tyranny. And in the 20th century we have seen how democracy based on rallies gave birth to the cult of the leader irrespective of whether he called himself Il Duce, fuhrer, or general secretary.

A parliamentary republic is the sole guarantee against a return to authoritarian power. The recent history of mankind is proof of this. Is it really an accident that the parliamentary republic is triumphing all over the world, particularly in those countries which over the course of centuries and millenniums knew only imperial or monarchist power? Such a republic has been established in the postwar period in Japan and India, Brazil and Argentina, Egypt and Israel, and in South Korea and many of the states of Asia and Africa. It is a high road to modern civilization which guarantees economic and social progress. Now it is our turn, if we do not wish to vegetate on civilization's roadside in the coming century as well.

Soviets are fully compatible with parliamentarianism. True, from the very first the notion of "soviets" contained the sense that this is an organ which consults, advises, but does not make decisions. But now the soviets are in fact turning into a genuinely parliamentary institute.

What does this mean for us today?

At present I do not have the opportunity to deal in detail with the problems of forming parliamentarianism in our country. I will emphasize only two or three problems which seem to me to be both preliminary and central.

First of all, of course, I am speaking about a new form for the union of our republics. A federation, however much we may wish to reanimate it, is in fact hardly possible any longer. This concept has been compromised too much by Stalinist supercentralism. We must look reality directly in the eye. Not only the Baltic republics but the Russian Federation as well has declared the supremacy of the republic's laws over the union's. It is naive to try to turn the wheel of history backward. It has already made an irreversible circuit. We will recall that in old Russia, which was called the jail of the peoples, great independence at the localities was preserved. There was a parliament in Finland, a sejm in Poland, and a khan in Bukhara.

Let us call things by their proper names. Let it be simply a union of republics. But such a union can be founded on a new voluntary agreement adopted at a congress of the peoples, to which all the soviets will send representatives.

In addition to this, the formation of a multiparty system as a parliamentary institution is of the greatest importance. And the matter is not resolved simply by passing a law on social organizations. It is time to openly and clearly constitute ourselves along the party principle within the framework of the soviets at all levels. We see

that at present a division into groups is taking place, but that as a rule it is along national and regional lines. The formation of programs and the nomination of leaders is a matter for parties. And so are the existence of a legal opposition and a normal procedure for parties to compete for the helm of the state.

I have already had to write several times about hastening the process of creating a new Constitution. It alone can strengthen a parliamentary soviet republic. The longer we put off its preparation, the more difficult and chaotic becomes the process of developing the republic in the country. Of course a new Constitution must be prepared in advance, as has happened in all countries, by a group of distinguished, progressively minded specialists. But it should be confirmed at the aforementioned congress of the peoples of the USSR.

Several words in conclusion about the social foundation of the republic. The ancient thinkers realized that the middle classes are just such a foundation. Only when they make up the majority will the republic find firm ground under its feet. Power of the rich is oligarchy, and power of the poor is mob rule. It is no accident that the middle classes are the support of parliamentarianism in the countries of the West.

What does that mean for us today? It means that all economic reforms must have as their chief goal the transformation of the poor strata, which make up no less than two-thirds of our society, into prosperous strata. Exactly this must be the final goal of economic reforms. We must not invoke the poor unless we wish a return to Stalinism!

And this is what a platform upon which the various democratic forces of the country can unite and cooperate looks like in my opinion. This platform is a parliamentary soviet republic, economic freedom and initiative, and a society that is open to cooperation with the entire modern world.

Justice Minister Yakovlev Discusses Court Reform

PM1406133590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

["Topical interview" with V.F. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice, by own correspondent G. Ovcharenko; place, date not given: "Law and Power"—first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The formation of the rule-of-law state and its administrative organs is taking place before our very eyes. The whole country is intently following the establishment of the institutions of legislative and executive power in a truly democratic manner, and the first steps which they are taking. Behind these events, obscured from the public view as it were, the formation of the organs of the third power, the judiciary, without which the very existence of the rule-of-law state is unthinkable, is under way. Meanwhile there are many problems in this sphere, as the editorial mailbag bears out. What do

these problems consist of and how are they being resolved? This is the theme of an interview with V.F. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice, by our correspondent.

[Ovcharenko] Veniamin Fedorovich, how do you assess the current state of the judiciary?

[Yakovlev] Essentially, in parallel with the establishment of the rule-of-law state, the establishment of all the three powers—the legislative, the executive, and naturally also the judiciary—is under way. However whereas the independence of the first two has already taken root in the rule-of-law consciousness, the independence and autonomy of the courts still only takes the form of declarative statements and has not yet become a rule of life.

[Ovcharenko] What is your explanation for this?

[Yakovlev] There are many reasons. Above all, this is the effect of the stereotyped attitude which prevailed for many years when power, undivided power that is, was above the law. Naturally, in that situation the courts occupied a lower position as a mere instrument of power. And during the years of repressions law was totally ignored and "troyka" and "special conference" type organs were set up which had nothing in common with the law. Subsequently the courts were practically controlled by the party apparatus, albeit not overtly. Do you recall the term "telephone law?" When a telephone call was frequently sufficient to decide the fate of a judge who tried to defend his independence.

[Ovcharenko] And now?

[Yakovlev] Now the situation must radically change. In a rule-of-law state law is the supreme authority, and all powers are subordinated to the law.

In my opinion the very essence of perestroika lies in establishing the law as the main regulator in all spheres of our life. Then all organs of power—legislative, executive, and judiciary—will operate accordingly, and citizens, while observing the law, will at the same time be under its protection. This, essentially, is the purport of the rule-of-law state.

[Ovcharenko] We frequently receive letters whose writers ask: How does the division of power affect the establishment of the supremacy of the law?

[Yakovlev] Legislative power creates laws while, at the same time, being subordinated to them. Executive power is obliged to organize the execution of the law—this is its essence. And, finally, the judiciary ensures the observance of the law by all and sundry, from the ordinary citizen to the country's top officials.

[Ovcharenko] How would you define the role of the courts in a rule-of-law state?

[Yakovlev] The work of the courts lies in ensuring the operation of the laws. The judge is the mouthpiece of the

law. The court ensures on the one hand that anyone who has violated the law is brought to book, while on the other hand it ensures the protection of those who suffer as a result of law violations. These are the two main functions of the courts. However, in order to implement them, the courts must enjoy autonomy.

[Ovcharenko] The legal reform, as is known, is working toward this goal. Laws on the judicial system and the status of judges have been adopted...

[Yakovlev] Nonetheless, even today many people, clearly through inertia, regard the courts as an organ which is subordinated to both the legislative and the executive. This is manifested even in the actions of deputies during the election of judges.

[Ovcharenko] Incidentally, the very mechanism for the election of judges has changed.

[Yakovlev] Yes, up to now people's judges were elected in our country by citizens on the basis of universal, direct, and equal suffrage in a secret ballot. We believed that this was an expression of genuine democracy. However, practice showed that the elections were largely formal in character.

Perestroika has introduced radical changes in the very approach to the formation of the body of judges. In accordance with Article 152 of the USSR Constitution they are now elected by superior soviets of people's deputies for a period of 10 years. The mechanism of selection of candidate judges has also been radically changed.

They are selected by judicial organs and superior courts on the basis of the opinion and recommendation of the labor collective in which a candidate is working. He then has to pass an examination in a qualification collegium which has been elected at a conference of judges. And only after the collegium has passed its conclusion is the candidacy for the post of judge submitted to the soviet of the appropriate level by the minister of justice and the chairman of the union republic supreme court for consideration. Without this conclusion people's deputies are not authorized to examine the question of the election of a specific judge. I would like to note furthermore that the decision of the qualification collegium cannot be appealed against or quashed by anyone.

[Ovcharenko] Yet, judging by our readers' letters, in a number of regions, for instance in Lithuania and the Ukraine, it is not just the new soviets but even representatives of specific political formations who are trying to nominate candidate judges, assess their professional qualities, and even interfere in the administration of justice.

[Yakovlev] All the situations which you have described are in breach of the procedure for the nomination and election of judges laid down by law. Nonetheless, we are also aware that cases like these have occurred.

[Ovcharenko] Are there many?

[Yakovlev] Quite a few. If in the past there was such a thing as "telephone law," it is now time to speak of "megaphone law." There have been cases when specific court decisions have been questioned at rallies and judges "removed" or "appointed." As a rule, the tone on these occasions has been set by the leaders of new political platforms who, as has been the case in Lvov and Ivano-Frankovsk, are up in arms because judges are examining cases connected with unauthorized rallies and other political events.

[Ovcharenko] Incidentally, Veniamin Fedorovich, it has been said that a judge must suspend his party membership when he takes up his post.

[Yakovlev] On what basis? The law makes no provision for this. In the United States a judge may belong to any party. It is another matter that he must administer justice independently of his political persuasions and sympathies and be guided solely by the law. Otherwise the mechanism for recalling judges is set in motion. However, this mechanism operates not on the basis of the will of the mob or of individual people but on the basis of law. However, to deprive a judge of the possibility of holding specific political views would be encroaching on his legitimate rights.

[Ovcharenko] Veniamin Fedorovich, you mentioned "megaphone law." However, judging by our readers' mail, it is time to introduce another term, "deputy law."

[Yakovlev] Alas, you are right. Here is an example which was cited recently at a press conference for Soviet journalists at the USSR Ministry of Justice. Last month I. Belomesov, chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Soviet Standing Commission for Socialist Legality, invited G. Kokunin, chairman of the Donetsk Kievskiy Rayon People's Court, and questioned him on two cases which had not yet been examined, and, demanding explanations about the nature of the cases, proposed to him that in one of the cases a second psychiatric opinion be sought because the conclusion that had been reached by an expert in one of the cases "evoked his doubts." And the very next day V. Ushenko, chairman of the city's Kalininskiy Rayon People's Court, was asked by the selfsame I. Belomesov for an explanation why a case had been decided in favor of the "Donetsknerudprom" production association rather than in favor of the plaintiff Ostapenko.

This is the most blatant and crude violation of the constitutional principle of the independence of judges and their subordination to the law alone.

[Ovcharenko] So what is to be done in these cases, Veniamin Fedorovich? How is the independence of judges to be upheld?

[Yakovlev] Exclusively with the help of the law. In this context I would like to remind you that the exertion of any kind of pressure on judges or people's assessors with a view to thwarting the objective examination of a specific case or obtaining an unlawful verdict is viewed

by the law not just as a violation of the principle of the independence of judges but as a criminal offense.

[Ovcharenko] Are there any examples of cases of contempt of court?

[Yakovlev] Not yet. First, this law has been passed only recently. And second, judges are frequently afraid to apply it. I have a memorandum here from Judge V. Krasavin of the Moscow Sverdlovskiy Rayon People's Court. In it he informs the court president that Comrade Titov, a Moscow Soviet people's deputy, implored him to suspend the implementation of an enforceable court decision on a compulsory exchange of housing. In reply to the judge's comment that legal grounds are needed for this, the deputy declared that judges depend on deputies and that unless his request was granted he would vote against the judge's election. This is not an isolated case.

[Ovcharenko] However, there is also another aspect of judges' independence. I am referring to material and technical supply, allocation of housing, installation of telephones, and so forth. At the moment judges largely depend on the selfsame soviets here.

[Yakovlev] What is more, new trends have emerged which evoke our concern. The leadership of certain republics, professing the on the whole good and useful principle of the development of local self-management, is trying to switch the upkeep of courts to the local budget. That means that a rayon court is maintained by the rayon soviet. What kind of independence is that?

There are also other methods used by local authorities to impinge on the independence of the courts. For instance, Comrade Anisimov, deputy chairman of the Kuybyshev Kirovskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee, replied to a letter from the president of the court requesting an apartment for one of the judges, that the allocation of housing to the court is becoming difficult because in a number of cases the court has upheld squatters' claims to housing. However, first, the occupation of the apartments was legal, and second, why does the rayon soviet executive committee contest the court decision by depriving its staffers of housing rather than follow the procedure laid down by law? Is that perhaps not exerting pressure on the court?

[Ovcharenko] In short, summing up our conversation it is possible to say that the mutual relations between the law and the organs of power are still far from simple and are fraught with many problems?

[Yakovlev] Basically this is correct. However, I believe that these problems are soluble. The main thing is to enhance people's awareness of the law. Above all on the part of people who have any connection with power.

Draft USSR Law on Public Associations

90US1007A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Draft law of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: "On Public Associations"]

[Text] The right to associate is an indispensable part of the rights of the individual and the citizen proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reinforced in the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics. The Soviet state, being interested in the development of the creative initiative and political activity of the citizens and their participation in the management of the state and the society, guarantees USSR citizens freedom to create public associations.

Chapter 1. General Provisions

Article 1. The Concept of the Public Association

A public association is a voluntary formation that has appeared as a result of the free and conscious expression of the will of the citizens who have decided to unite on the basis of a community of interests of the members. The purposes of public associations are determined in their charter (provisions, other acts).

Public associations in the sense used in the present law are political parties and mass movements, including people's fronts, trade unions, women's, veterans', youth, and children's organizations, voluntary societies, creative unions, funds, groups, and other associations of citizens.

The present law does not apply to cooperative and other organizations that pursue commercial goals or contribute to the gain of profit (income) by other enterprises and organizations, religious organizations, organs for territorial public self-management (soviets and committees of microrayons, building, street, block, settlement, and village committees and so forth), organs for independent social activity (people's detachments, comrades' courts, and so forth), the policy for whose creation and activity is determined by legislation.

Article 2. Legislation on Public Associations

Legislation on public associations consists of the present law, which determines the foundations of the legal position of public associations, and laws of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics and other legislative acts published in keeping with it.

Article 3. Purposes of the Creation and Activity of Public Associations

Public associations are created for the following purposes: the development of the political activity and self-expression of the citizens; participation of the citizens in management of state and public affairs; protection of their political, socioeconomic, and personal rights and freedoms; satisfaction of occupational and recreational interests; development of scientific, technical, and artistic creativity; protection of the health of the population; participation in philanthropic activity; engagement in mass sports and physical culture; cultural and educational work among the population; protection of nature, monuments of history, and culture; patriotic

and humanistic education; expansion of international ties and strengthening of friendship among nations; and other activity not prohibited by the law.

The creation and activity of public associations whose purpose is violent overthrow or alteration of the constitutional structure, violation of the unity of the territory of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, propaganda for war, violence, or brutality, inflammation of social, national, or religious dissension, or other criminally punishable acts are forbidden.

The creation and activity of public associations that affect the health and morality of the population or the rights and legally protected interests of the citizens are prosecuted in keeping with the law.

Article 4. Principles of the Creation and Activity of Public Associations

All public associations when performing the functions envisioned by their programs and charter operate within the framework of the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, and Soviet laws.

Public associations are created and operate on the basis of voluntary action, equal rights of their members (participants), self-management, legality, and openness.

A citizen's participation in the activity of a public organization must not serve as a basis for restricting his rights or a condition for employment in a state organization, or a justification for the state to grant him any privileges or advantages either. A requirement to indicate membership in one or public association or another in official documents is prohibited.

Article 5. The State and Public Associations

The state guarantees public associations the conditions for their successful performance of their designated tasks.

Questions affecting the interests of public associations, in cases envisioned by legislation, are resolved by state organs with the participation or the consent of the corresponding public associations.

The intervention of state organs in the activity of public associations, like the intervention of public associations in the activity of state organs, is not allowed except in cases where this is envisioned by the law.

Article 6. Union-wide and other Public Associations

Union-wide, republic (of union and autonomous republics), interrepublic, and local public associations are created in the USSR.

The union-wide public associations include associations whose activity, based on their nature and designated tasks, extends to the territory of all or most union republics and which have divisions in these republics.

Article 7. Unions of Public Associations

Public associations have a right to join together on a voluntary basis into unions of associations. The procedure for the formation and activity of unions of public associations and the procedure for halting their activity are determined in keeping with the present law.

Chapter 2. Formation of Public Associations and Curtailment of Their Activity

Article 8. Founders of Public Associations

Public associations are created on the initiative of USSR citizens who are of age. The founders of youth organizations may be USSR citizens who have reached 15 years of age.

USSR citizens numbering no less than 1,000 may be founders of union-wide political parties or trade unions. Citizens numbering no less than 10 may be founders of other public associations.

The founders of public associations convene the constituent congress (conference) or general meeting at which the charter (provisions, other document) is adopted and the management organs are formed.

Article 9. Membership in Public Associations

Members (participants) in public associations are USSR citizens. The charters of public associations may provide for the membership in them of foreign citizens or people without citizenship.

Mass movements do not have an individual fixed membership.

In cases envisioned by the charter, collective members participate in the activity of public associations: enterprises, institutions, organizations, and associations of citizens.

Article 10. Charter of the Public Association

The charter of the public association (provisions, other acts) should envision:

- 1) the name and purpose of the public association;
- 2) the structure of the public association and the territory within which it carries out its activity;
- 3) the conditions and procedure for admission to membership in the public association and withdrawal from it in cases when the association has a fixed membership;
- 4) the rights and responsibilities of members (participants) of the public association;
- 5) the competence of and procedure for forming the management organs of the public association, the length of their terms of office, and the location;
- 6) sources of the formation of capital and other property of the public association;

7) the procedure for making changes and additions to the charter of the public association;

8) the procedure for curtailing the activity of the public association.

The charter may also envision other provisions pertaining to the creation and activity of the public association.

Article 11. Registration of Charters of Public Associations

The charters (provisions, other documents) of public association are subject to registration.

Registration of the charter of a union-wide public association is carried out by the USSR Ministry of Justice and the charter of other public associations is registered by state organs to which these functions have been assigned through legislative acts of the union and autonomous republics.

In order to register the charter of a union-wide public association within a month from the day of the adoption of its regulations, an application signed by no fewer than three members of the management organ of the given public association is submitted to the USSR Ministry of Justice. Appended to the application are the charter, the minutes of the constituent congress (conference) or the general meeting that adopted the charter, and materials confirming observance of the requirements established by the present law. The application for registration of the charter is considered within two months of the day it is received.

The procedure and time periods for registration of the charters of other public associations are determined by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

Changes and additions to the charters of public associations are subject to registration under the same policy and within the same time periods as for the registration of the charters.

Organs carrying out registration of charters of public associations keep a register of these associations.

From the day of the registration of the charter of the public association—and if it does not have a fixed membership, the charter of its organ—the public association in keeping with civil legislation may be recognized as a corporate body.

For registration of the charter of a public association and subsequent changes and additions to it, fees are charged according to the procedure and in the amounts established by legislation of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

Article 12. Rejection of Registration of the Charter of a Public Association

The registration of the charter of a public association may be refused only in cases when its provisions contradict the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, the present law, or other legislative acts.

In the event that the registration of the charter is rejected the applicants are notified of this in writing with an indication of the provisions of legislation which the proposed charter contradicts.

Refusal to register a charter of a union-wide public association may be appealed within one month to the USSR Supreme Court.

Refusal to register the charters of other public associations may be appealed in court under the policy and within the time periods established by legislative acts of the union and autonomous republics.

Article 13. Symbols of the Public Associations

Public associations may have as symbols emblems, flags, and banners.

The emblems of public associations are approved by their leadership organs in keeping with the charters. Flags and banners are subject to state registration according to the procedure determined by the USSR Council of Ministers and the councils of ministers of the union and autonomous republics.

Article 14. Curtailment of the Activity of Public Associations

The activity of public associations may be curtailed through reorganization (merging, unification, separation) or elimination.

The reorganization of public associations is carried out by decisions of their congresses or general meetings. The registration of the charter of the public associations newly formed after reorganization is carried out according to the procedure established by Article 11 of the present law.

The elimination of the public association is carried out: by a decision of the congress (conference) or general meeting;

on the basis of and according to the procedure envisioned by Article 21 of the present law.

The property of the public association that has curtailed its activity is used for purposes envisioned by its charter unless otherwise established by law.

Chapter 3. Rights and Conditions for the Activity of Public Associations

Article 15. The Rights of Public Associations

In order to carry out their goals and tasks envisioned by their charters, according to the procedure established by legislation, public associations have the following rights:

to participate in the formation of organs of state power and administration;

to conduct legislative initiative;

to participate in the development of decisions of organs of state power and management;

to represent and defend the legitimate interests of their members (participants) in state and public organs;

to exercise other authority envisioned by the present law and other legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

Article 16. The Production-Economic Activity of the Associations

Public associations, according to the procedure determined by legislation, carry out production and economic activity and create enterprises and economically accountable organizations only for the purposes of carrying out the tasks envisioned in their charters.

Revenues from the production and economic activity of the public associations may not be distributed among members (participants) of these associations and are used only for carrying out the tasks in their charters.

Enterprises and organizations created by public associations make payments into the budget according to the procedure and in the amounts established by the law.

Article 17. Property of Public Associations

Public associations may own buildings, structures, housing, equipment, supplies, property for cultural-educational and health purposes, monetary funds, shares, other securities, and other property necessary for material support of the activity envisioned by their charters. Public associations may also own enterprises created with the funds of these associations in keeping with the goals indicated in their charters.

Monetary funds of public associations are formed from initiation and membership fees if their charters envision the payment of these; voluntary contributions and donations; revenues from conducting lectures, exhibitions, and sports and other measures and lotteries in keeping with the charter; revenues from production-economic and publishing activity; and other revenues not prohibited by law.

The authority of unions and associations included in them to own, use, and dispose of property belonging to these unions and associations included in them are determined by the charters of the unions or associations.

Legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics may establish the kind of property which, out of considerations for state and public security or in keeping with international agreements of the USSR, may not be owned by public associations.

Public associations may receive monetary funds or other property coming from abroad in keeping with the goals and tasks established by their charters and according to the procedure determined by legislation.

Political parties and social movements pursuing political goals do not have the right to receive financial or other material aid from foreign organizations or citizens.

Article 18. The Mass Media and Publishing Activity of Public Associations

Public associations have the right to establish mass media and carry out publishing activity in keeping with legislation of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics concerning the press and other mass media and other legislative acts.

Chapter 4. Monitoring the Activity of Public Associations. Responsibility for Violation of the Law

Article 19. Supervision and Monitoring of the Activity of Public Associations

Supervision of the observance of the law in the activity of public associations is provided by the USSR general procurator and the procurators under his jurisdiction.

Financial organs provide for monitoring of the financial activity of public associations. Public associations submit to financial organs information about the sources and amounts of funds received by the associations. The procedure and time periods for submitting data about the sources and amounts of funds and also the procedure for inspecting the financial activity of public associations are determined by tax legislation.

Article 20. Grounds for Liability

Violations of legislation on public associations entail criminal, administrative, material, or other liability in keeping with legislation of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

Liability for violation of legislation on public associations is born by officials of state and social organs and also citizens guilty of this.

Article 21. Elimination of the Public Association in Cases of Their Violation of the Requirements of Their Charter or the Law

In the event that the public association commits actions that exceed the limits of its goals and tasks as determined by its charter, this public association may be given a warning.

The public association is eliminated by a court decision in the following cases:

when during the course of a year the public association repeatedly commits actions stipulated by part one of the present law and also repeatedly violates the law;

when the public association commits actions stipulated in part two of Article 3 of the present law.

The curtailment of the activity of union-wide and inter-republic public associations is carried out by a decision of the USSR Supreme Court at the request of the procurator and also at the request of other organs authorized for this by USSR legislation. Until the USSR Supreme Court makes a decision, the activity of the corresponding public associations is halted. The decision of the USSR Supreme Court concerning elimination of the public association is not subject to appeal.

Curtailment of the activity of other public associations is carried out by the court according to the procedure envisioned by the union and autonomous republics.

Chapter 5. International Ties of Public Associations. International Public Associations. International Agreement

Article 22. International Ties of Public Associations

Public associations in keeping with their charters may enter international public (nongovernmental) organizations, maintain direct international contacts and ties, conclude the corresponding agreements, and also participate in measures that do not contradict the international commitment of the USSR and the union republics.

Article 23. International Public Associations

A public association is declared international if its activity in keeping with its charter extends to the territory of the USSR and one or more foreign countries. The charter of an international public association is subject to registration in the USSR Ministry of Justice in keeping with the present law.

If an international public association includes as a collective member a Soviet public association its charter is also subject to registration.

A public association which has registered in the USSR and then extended its activity to the territory of a foreign country must submit its charter to the USSR Ministry of Justice with the necessary changes and additions for reregistration.

Article 24. International Agreements

If a USSR international agreement establishes different rules from the ones contained in Soviet legislation concerning public associations, the rules of the international agreement apply.

1975 Leningrad AES Accident Admitted

*LD1406200290 Helsinki International Service
in Finnish 1600 GMT 14 Jun 90*

[Text] The Radiation Protection Center has received confirmation from the Soviet authorities that the first unit of the Leningrad nuclear power station [AES] had

an accident in November 1975. The accident had not been notified abroad before. According to the information it received, the Radiation Protection Center estimates that the accident in Leningrad—on the scale of seriousness of nuclear power station incidents—is possibly classified in class three; that is, it would be a serious incident.

Trans-Antarctic Explorers Meet Leaders

Meet Shevardnadze

LD1606233190 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT
16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received participants in the international trans-Antarctic expedition staying in the Soviet Union.

The participants in the expedition expressed gratitude to the Soviet people and Soviet Government for the support for their action which called attention to international cooperation in Antarctica and showed that despite distinctions among peoples, they can be friendly and can jointly undertake projects.

Shevardnadze conveyed to the participants in the expedition Mikhail Gorbachev's greetings and congratulations. Shevardnadze emphasized international importance of this action. It shows that humanity can save itself from nuclear and ecological catastrophe by joint efforts.

The expedition highlighted the importance of the treaty on the Antarctica on the basis of which broad international interaction is implemented, and a zone free from nuclear weapons and military presence has actually formed.

Meet Lukyanov

LD1606162190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1525 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jun (TASS)—Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received participants in the international "Trans-Antarctic" expedition today. The courageous explorers have, for the first time in the history of the mastery of the Antarctic, crossed the ice continent of our planet by the longest route: From the south extremity via the South Pole to the Soviet station of "Mirnyy."

Having conveyed Mikhail Gorbachev's greetings and warmest wishes to the expedition's participants, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet stressed that their joint action had demonstrated the capacity of people of various countries to cooperate in extreme conditions. This means that the opportunity exists for agreement to be reached on any vital issue. It was noted that this unique event has drawn the world public's attention to the problems of the world's sixth continent. He stressed the great advantages that would accrue to

humanity with a treaty on the Antarctic which opened up extensive opportunities for international scientific and ecological cooperation for exclusively peaceful purposes.

Profound gratitude was expressed by the expedition participants for the support of the Soviet people and the USSR Government.

The expedition participants were received earlier by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Lukyanov Meets With Soviet Buddhist Leader

PM1806093990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p3

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] On 13 June A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received Did-Khambo Lama Ch.-D. Budayev, deputy chairman of the Central Spiritual Administration of USSR Buddhists.

During their conversation they discussed a broad range of issues concerning the life of Buddhists, their peace-making and international activity, the position of the Buddhist religion in the country, and ways to promote the development of Buddhist culture and traditional Tibetan medicine.

Did-Khambo Lama spoke of his support for the transformations taking place in Soviet society and expressed the hope that the adoption of the USSR Law "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" will resolve many problems for all of the country's believers.

Primakov Visits PRAVDA Offices 13 Jun

PM1806092390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Al. Stepanov report: "At the PRAVDA Press Club"]

[Text] On 13 June Ye.M. Primakov, member of the Presidential Council and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, was the guest at a meeting of the press club of journalists writing on international affairs organized by the PRAVDA editorial office. The meeting was attended by representatives of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, NOVOYE VREMYA, TASS, the State Committee for Radio and Television Broadcasting, and other mass media. I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, took part in the meeting.

Ye.M. Primakov answered questions from those present. Discussion centered on the course and results of the U.S. summit, the changes in East Europe, the unification of Germany, the work of the Presidential Council, and preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

A detailed account of the meeting at the press club will be published in one of the newspaper's next issues.

Moscow Procuracy Taking Action Over Antisemitism

LD1806140290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1254 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—The Moscow Procuracy bodies have instituted criminal proceedings in connection with the desecration of several Jewish graves at the Vagankovskoye cemetery in the capital, a TASS correspondent was informed in the USSR Interior Ministry. Unknown hooligans have painted fascist swastika signs on the tombs. Charges have been brought on the grounds of two articles of the Soviet criminal law, including "for a breach of ethnic and racial equality."

A ministry spokesman said that the law enforcement bodies are taking necessary steps to stop the tendencies of chauvinism, nationalism, and antisemitism. In Tashkent recently (the capital of Uzbekistan) several minors were brought before the court for desecrating Jewish graves.

The USSR Interior Ministry spokesman reported that the investigation into the circumstances of the antisemitic incident which took place in the Moscow House of Writers in January this year is drawing to a close.

Moscow Filmmakers Union Formed

LD1806130990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0330 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] The passions of the sixth congress of USSR filmmakers had not had time to cool when the capital's film community, assembled at its own forum, established the Moscow Union of Filmmakers. This is a sovereign subject on a federal basis. Film director Sergey Solov'yev was elected chairman. The leadership of the Moscow association of screen craftsmen met journalists on Sunday.

CPSU Launches New GLASNOST Magazine

PM1806083390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "First Issue of GLASNOST"]

[Text] The first issue of the weekly GLASNOST: INFORMATSIIYA, MNENIYA, KOMMENTARIY [Glasnost: Information, Opinions, Comments]—a supplement of the IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS journal—has been published and is being dispatched to subscribers.

These are times of questions. They are being asked in letters, at meetings, conferences, congresses, and meetings with working people. According to its editorial board, the weekly GLASNOST will seek to answer the most interesting among them.

Christian Newspaper Issued in Donetsk

LD1806130590 Moscow World Service in English
1100 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Excerpt] The first issue of a new newspaper translated as the CHRISTIAN OF DONBASS has come out in the miners' city of Donetsk. This is the newspaper of the regional council of Evangelical Christian Baptists and the (Kapcheg) mission. [passage omitted]

Economic

PRAVDA 'Forced' To Resume Six-Page Format

PM1506180190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "To Our Readers"]

[Text] Today the whole country is awaiting highly important political events—the Russian party conference and the 28th CPSU Congress. The attention of millions of readers is riveted on our press, notably on PRAVDA, where an extensive pre-congress discussion of the most pressing problems in the life of the party and the country is now under way.

Considering the special burden borne by PRAVDA as the central party organ in connection with the forthcoming congress and other important political events, the CPSU Central Committee decided to increase the size of the newspaper for the period through the close of the congress. Extending the regular publication of the pre-congress "Discussion Pamphlet," which has become a truly nationwide rostrum, eight-page editions of PRAVDA have been appearing every day since 10 May, and this met with our readers' approval and support. The intention was to compensate for any possible overconsumption of newsprint at a later stage.

However, the holdups with newsprint that occurred previously may be said to have become chronic over the last few months. Life has shown that organizations responsible for the delivery and distribution of newsprint are not coping with their tasks. Thus, in early June the newspapers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, and PRAVDA were not printed in 17 cities in the country owing to a lack of newsprint. The irregular appearance of these and other central publications has become a regular occurrence in many oblasts. The situation that has developed with the journal NOVYY MIR—its subscribers are only now receiving its third, that is the March, issue—is well known. Publication of the journals RABOTNITSA, KRESTYANKA, ZDOROVYE, SOVETSKIY SOYUZ, and SOVETSKAYA ZHENSCHINA is in real jeopardy today.

We sympathize with our colleagues from these and other publications which are also experiencing serious difficulties. This at a time when paper is still being squandered and used in an ill-considered, uncontrolled manner.

The PRAVDA Publishing House's annual shortfall of newsprint totals 51,600 tonnes. The publishing house and our editorial office have raised this question with the USSR Council of Ministers on several occasions; however, the situation has not improved but has deteriorated. Now, on the very eve of the Russian party conference and the 28th party congress, circumstances have forced us to produce six-page editions every day and to abandon many of our creative plans. Today we are publishing in abridged form and have no chance of even producing Saturday's traditional "Discussion Pamphlet" for which we apologize to our readers.

We regard the reduction in the size of the newspaper on the threshold of these highly important political events in the life of the party and the whole country as a powerful blow to glasnost on the part of workers who do not realize their responsibility for providing it with material backup and fail to perform their direct official duty.

Being forced to switch to six-page editions of the newspaper, we hope that we will succeed in saving paper in order to provide extensive information—where possible the requisite amount of information—about the work of the Russian party conference and the 28th CPSU Congress. We ask you, dear readers, to treat the current situation with understanding.

Price Formation, Compensation Discussed

PM1806100590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with V. Shprygin, director of the Scientific Research Institute For Price Formation, by correspondent M. Gurtovoy: "Do the Rich Have a Better Appetite?"]

[Text] [Gurtovoy] Many people wonder why, of the R198 billion by which the government program for the transition to the market plans to increase prices, the population is being compensated for only R135 billion. In this connection the idea is being heard that the government is acting unfairly and trying through a prices reform to resolve its financial problems by lowering, and lowering considerably, the population's living standard.

[Shprygin] As is well known, the total sum by which prices will be increased for food may be R111.9 billion. This sum will be compensated for almost fully. The rise in prices should not be compensated only for that output which is to be sold on the free market. That is mainly so-called "delicatessen" output. That includes primarily raw smoked foods and raw smoked sausage and gourmet types of fish. For other food output the population will be compensated for the entire sum. The increase in prices for light industry output, for clothing and shoes,

will be fully compensated too. Of course, it is not a case of particularly fashionable output.

[Gurtovoy] The increase in prices for meat perturbs many people. They write to us that there are rumors that prices for meat will increase to R8 or even R10. What will compensation be like then? Using the example of meat, let us try to ascertain the "philosophy of compensation," so to speak.

[Shprygin] If prices for this output were set strictly according to market economy principles, that might possibly be the case. A forecast of the market situation shows that prices for this output under the influence of demand might leap to R18-20 initially. Such prices would create an explosive social situation. That is why the state proposes setting retail prices approximately three times lower than those cited.

For that it will be obliged to compensate the producer for some proportion of his expenses, although on smaller scales than it does now, and at the same time compensate the population for all additional expenditure connected with the increase in prices. An increase in meat consumption of one kilogram [per capita] involves the state in an additional loss of R1 billion. So we are marking time. As is well known, today the statistically average consumption of meat per capita is 5.5 kg a month. Here those with an income of under R50 consume correspondingly less than two kg while those with an income of over R200 consume over eight kg. In this that means some people consume one kilogram of meat a month, some do not consume any meat at all, and some consume 15 kg. With the present subsidy which the state pays to the population by reducing retail prices, and this subsidy is approximately three rubles per kilogram, some people receive the subsidy of three rubles and other R45.

If we raise prices for meat from, let us say, two rubles to five rubles, each person will receive according to the norm a subsidy of R16.5. It is thus easy to calculate that R13.5 will go to benefit the low paid.

[Gurtovoy] And now let's talk about the compensation mechanism. How specifically will a person receive compensation?

[Shprygin] Workers will receive it in the form of direct wage increases while pensioners will have pension increases and students grant increases. It is planned that it will be approximately 15 percent of wages, but not less than R40. That is, those for whom 15 percent is less than R40 will still receive their R40.

[Gurtovoy] And those who earn R1,000?

[Shprygin] Their R150.

[Gurtovoy] But surely a highly paid man does not need more calories to live, surely he does not wear four shoes at once.... Yet you said that gourmet food and highly fashionable goods are not compensated. Why should compensation for some people be higher than other people's wages? Perhaps it is better to calculate the entire

consumer's shopping basket per person and to compensate everyone with the same sum?

[Shprygin] I have no counterarguments. Probably that is better from the viewpoint of social justice. And that is the main viewpoint. I merely want to add something. With that option it is probably necessary to take into account supplements for those who live in the north and work at production facilities harmful to health.

Resolution on Enactment of Enterprise Law

904A0424B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 12 Jun 90 p 1

[Decree of USSR Supreme Soviet "On the Procedure For Putting the USSR Law 'On USSR Enterprises' Into Effect"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

1. To put into effect the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR" as of 1 January 1991; and Section IV, which regulates questions of appointing and discharging managers and officials of the enterprise, as of the time the law is published; paragraph 2 of point 1 of Article 24 for state enterprises—as of 1 January 1993.

2. Legislative acts that are in effect that do not contradict this law are to be applied until legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics is brought into line with the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR." Decisions of the USSR Government and the governments of the union and autonomous republics concerning questions which, in keeping with them, may be regulated only by legislative acts, remain in effect until the adoption of the corresponding legislative acts.

3. The USSR Council of Ministers must:

before 1 July 1990:

develop and submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet the procedure for delegating the rights of the owner of the property of state enterprises to the councils (boards) of these enterprises;

before 1 September 1990:

submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals concerning bringing existing USSR legislative acts into line with the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR";

bring decrees and instructions of the USSR Government into line with this law;

provide for revision and abolition by USSR ministries, state committees, and departments of their normative acts, including instructions, that contradict this law;

before 1 November 1990:

adopt decisions necessary for putting the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR" into effect;

submit for approval to the USSR Supreme Soviet a list of kinds of products, work, services, and production by-products whose free sale is prohibited or restricted and a list of kinds of economic activity which requires special permission (license).

4. Order that the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics bring legislation of the union and autonomous republics into line with the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR."

5. The commission of the Soviet Union for questions of development of industry, energy, technical equipment, and technology is to establish control over the implementation of the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR" and report the results of the effect of the law to the USSR Supreme Soviet in June 1991.

[Signed] Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet A. Lukyanov
Moscow, The Kremlin, 4 June 1990.

Law on State Tax Inspectorates Published

904A0401A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[USSR Law "On the Rights, Duties, and Responsibilities of the State Tax Inspectorates"]

[Text] The present law sets forth the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the state tax inspectorates in the course of their collection of taxes and other mandatory contributions to the budget and monitoring the correctness of calculation and payment of these contributions, as well as compliance with the tax legislation.

Article 1. Rights of the State Tax Inspectorates

1. The Main State Tax Inspectorate of the USSR Ministry of Finance, state tax inspectorates of the Ministries of Finance of union and autonomous republics, state tax inspectorates of krais, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, rayons, cities, and city rayons are given the right:

a) to audit financial documents, books, reports, plans, cost estimates, declarations, and other documents associated with the computation and payment of taxes and other mandatory contributions to the budget in ministries and departments, at state, cooperative, and public enterprises, in organizations and offices, at enterprises, offices, and organizations based on other forms of property, including joint enterprises, associations, and organizations with the participation of Soviet and foreign legal persons and citizens, as well as USSR citizens, foreign citizens, and stateless persons (henceforth referred to as enterprises, offices, organizations, and citizens), as well as to receive necessary explanations, reference materials, and information regarding the issues which arise during audits;

b) to receive information, reference materials, documents and their copies concerning the operation of the

audited enterprises, organizations (including banks and other finance and credit establishments), and citizens necessary for the purposes of taxation;

c) in the line of exercising their powers, to inspect (observing relevant rules) any production, storage, trade, and other premises of enterprises, organizations, and citizens which are used to generate income or are associated with maintaining objects of taxation regardless of their location. In the event citizens refuse to allow the officials of the state inspectorates to inspect the above premises, the state tax inspectorates are entitled to determine the taxable income of such individuals on the basis of documents indicating the receipt of income by them, taking into account taxes levied on individuals involved in similar activities;

d) to demand that the managers and other officials of the enterprises, offices, organizations, as well as citizens, eliminate the detected violations of legislation on taxes and other mandatory payments to the budget and the laws on individual labor activities, as well as monitor their execution;

e) to suspend the operations of enterprises, offices, and organizations on settlement and other accounts in banks and other finance and credit establishments in the event of failure (or refusal) to submit to the state tax inspectorates and their officials accounting reports, balances, calculations, declarations, and other documents associated with the calculation and payment of taxes and other mandatory contributions to the state budget;

f) to seize documents which testify to the concealment (underreporting) of income (profits) or other objects of taxation from enterprises and organizations, and business licenses or certificates of registration from the citizens who violate procedures for engaging in individual labor activities, with materials on the violations being subsequently referred to the executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies which have issued permits to engage in the above activities;

g) to verify the genuineness of the data on the sources of receiving the funds indicated in the declarations submitted by citizens who engage in transactions worth over R10,000, as well as those who have built a residential building (second house) worth more than R20,000.

h) to impose on enterprises, offices, organizations, and citizens financial sanctions in the form of withholding:

the entire amount of concealed (underreported) profit (income) or the amount of tax on other concealed (unregistered) objects of taxation plus a fine coming to the same amount, and in the case of a repeat violation—a fine which is double the amount;

ten percent of the amount of taxes or other mandatory payments due for the non-registration of profits (incomes) or carrying out such registration in violation of the established procedures, as well as for the failure to submit, or submitting late, tax declarations, reports,

calculations, and other documents necessary to calculate and pay taxes and other mandatory contributions to the budget;

i) to collect for the budget unpaid taxes and other mandatory contributions to the budget, as well as the amount of fines and other sanctions envisaged by subpoint "h" of the present point and other legislative acts of the USSR and union republics from enterprises, offices, and organizations through procedures not subject to appeal, and from the citizens through the courts;

j) to bring arbitration cases and lawsuits against enterprises, offices, organizations, and citizens for appropriating as state revenue funds which they received as a result of unlawful transactions, and in other cases of obtaining funds not on the grounds envisaged by legislation;

k) to impose administrative fines:

on the officials of enterprises, offices, and organizations guilty of concealing (underreporting) incomes (profits) or concealing (failing to register) other objects of taxation, as well as of the absence of bookkeeping, maintaining books in violation of the established procedures, or distortion of accounting reports, of filing late, failing to file, or filing accounting reports, calculations, declarations, and other documents associated with the computation and payment of taxes and other contributions to the budget in an unapproved format—in the amount of R100 to 200, and for the same acts committed again within one year—in the amount of R200 to 300;

on citizens guilty of violating procedures for engaging in individual labor activities or engaging in individual labor activities with regard to which a specific ban has been issued, as well as those citizens guilty of the absence of income records or guilty of maintaining them in violation of the established procedures, of failing to file or filing late declarations on their incomes or entering distorted data in the declarations, including declarations on the sources of obtaining funds for consummating transactions worth over R10,000, or citizens who have built a house (second house) worth more than R20,000—in the amount of R50 to 100, and for the same actions committed again within one year after the imposition of an administrative penalty—in the amount of R200 to 300;

on the officials of enterprises, offices, and organizations, as well as citizens, who fail to comply with the demands of the state tax inspectorates and their officials enumerated in subpoints "b" through "e" of the present point—in the amounts of R50 to 200 and R25 to 100 respectively.

2. The rights of the state tax inspectorates envisaged by subpoints "a" through "g" of point 1 of the present article of the law are given to the officials of these inspections, and the rights envisaged by subpoints "h" through "k" of the same point only to the chiefs of state tax inspectorates and their deputies.

3. The Main State Tax Inspectorate of the USSR Ministry of Finances is given the right to cancel the decisions of the state tax inspectorates of the ministries of finance of the union and autonomous republics in the event they do not comply with the law, and the state tax inspectorates of the ministries of finance of the union and autonomous republics are given the right to cancel the decisions of lower-level state tax inspectorates.

Article 2. Duties and Responsibilities of the State Tax Inspectorates

Officials of the state tax inspectorates have a duty to comply strictly with the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, the laws of the USSR and union republics, other normative acts, the rights and interests of enterprises, offices, organizations, and citizens protected by law. In compliance with the law in effect, officials of the state tax inspectorates are subject to disciplinary, administrative, and criminal penalties for failing to perform their duties or for performing them improperly.

The amounts of taxes and other mandatory contributions incorrectly collected by the state tax inspectorates are to be returned, and losses caused by the unlawful actions of inspectorate officials are to be compensated in keeping with procedures set forth by the legislation of the USSR and union republics from the funds of respective budgets.

Article 3. Appealing the Actions of Officials of the State Tax Inspectorates

Complaints about the actions of officials of the state tax inspectorates are filed at the state tax inspectorates to which they are directly subordinated. The complaints are reviewed and decisions on them are made within one month of the filing of the complaint. Decisions on complaints may be appealed within one month to a superior state tax inspectorate. If citizens do not agree with the decision made, the actions of officials may be appealed through the courts.

The filing of a complaint does not suspend the appealed action of the officials of state tax inspectorates.

Actions of the officials of the state tax inspectorates associated with the imposition of administrative penalties are appealed in keeping with the legislation of the USSR and the union republics on administrative violations of the law.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Moscow, the Kremlin, 21 May 1990

New Securities Exchange Opens in Moscow

LD1806131190 Moscow World Service in English
1100 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] A branch of the National Securities Exchange has opened here in Moscow. It is to play an important role in

introducing sweeping changes in the Soviet economy and moving over to a regulated market. There opens a vast field of activity before it. On the one hand there is a big amount of money in the commercial banks, and on the other there are many big industrial enterprises ready to start issuing stock and securities. The Moscow branch of the exchange intends to make the first operations already next month. The planned turnover is to be no less than R300 million a year.

Western Banks Cut Credits to USSR

LD1506142690 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1300 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Paris, June 15 (TANJUG)—Western banks have cut credits to the Soviet Union of late, Paris financial circles claim.

In France, the reduction is up to 20 percent. Creditors are also beginning to speedily free themselves of Soviet bonds, selling them on the stock markets up to ten percent below the price, while the price of new credits to the Soviet Union has gone up by two percent.

As reported by well-informed sources, over 200 Western banks met a fortnight ago to demand that the governments engage themselves in resolving the Soviet insolvency.

In financiers' view, the Soviet crisis is not of a temporary character and needs deep reforms without delay. Waiting for such reforms, Western banks have lost a great deal of their enthusiasm for business deals with the Soviet Union and some companies have even discontinued their deliveries, in expectation of the development of the situation.

The change is the result of the Soviet non-payment of obligations which have become due, currently estimated at over \$2 billion. Claims have been voiced in Paris that the Soviet Central Bank recently contacted Western partners in order to offer them its gold instead of foreign currency.

However, due to an increased sale of Soviet gold over the first few months this year—which according to some estimates equalled the total sale last year—the price of gold is on a decline. In France, for example, it is currently at its lowest level in eight years, selling 66,100 francs per gold bar.

The Soviet Union is making efforts to find a way out in increased oil exports to the convertible markets, it is said here.

Moscow also counts on increased arms sale, which last year brought it a record \$6 billion. It is not certain, however, whether the sale will continue at the same rate as Third World countries, the principal buyers of Soviet arms, are finding it increasingly difficult to pay back their debts in this area.

Leaseholders' Union President Outlines Aims*PM1806111190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 14 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by Tatyana Komarova, Yu. Prokofyev, identified by caption, from the Constituent Congress of the Union of Entrepreneurs and Leaseholders of Russia]

[Text] [Newscaster] The Constituent Congress of the Union of Entrepreneurs and Leaseholders of Russia opened in Moscow today. Toward the end of the day a decision was adopted to regard this congress not only as the constituent congress but also as the first congress, so as not to waste time on extra sessions.

[Correspondent] I must say that the congress went fairly smoothly even though emotions did flare up at times. This is not because leaseholders have fewer problems now, but proceedings are getting more civilized. This was probably partly due to Pavel Grigoriyevich Bunich, president of the USSR Union of Leaseholders, whose prestige both as a scientist and a man of integrity is very high. He delivered a report. You can see him speaking [video shows Bunich addressing delegates].

The first thing he said was that a certain level of agreement has been reached with the Ministry of Finance as regards taxes. We have it in black and white—45 percent, rather than 70 percent as originally suggested. A taxation law is expected to be adopted by the end of the year, which will mean freedom also in respect of leaseholders' wage rates. This is progress, modest though it may be.

One of the key questions is still the leaseholders' right to purchase enterprises or to acquire them without charge. Many enterprises have repaid their cost to the state several times over already. And now they will have to pay again for old means of production instead of investing money in augmenting or updating output. Delegates are asking whether this is logical, and whether it will not mean that the process which the country needs will drag on for 10 to 15 years when not even two years are available to get it off the ground.

Great hopes are being pinned on the dynamism of Svetoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov, who has been elected president of the Russian Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs.

Svetoslav Nikolayevich, people ask your advice because you are managing a real business, and because you succeeded in breaking down the barriers a long time before they started being dismantled. Running a real business, why have you agreed to accept the job which you have taken on today?

[S.N. Fedorov, director general of the Moscow Eye Microsurgery Clinic, identified by caption, facing camera] First of all, I want to help our people, Soviet people, to finally become free workers, that is, to switch from forced labor to free labor.

Apart from that, we have accumulated a considerable amount of experience operating in leasehold conditions over the past three and a half years. And third, I am hoping that my job will consist mainly of political, fundamental tasks, of working out the strategic avenues of the development of the leasehold movement. I believe that the most important thing is to establish an information service which will make it possible for all leaseholders to unite and to know who is producing what, so that they do not have to depend on the Main Administration for Material and Technical Supply and the State Planning Committee, and depend as little as possible on the Council of Ministers. That is to say to create a more or less normal entrepreneurial economy.

[Newscaster] As you have just heard, the main aim of Fedorov and many other participants in the leaseholders' congress is to help people to become truly free workers who do not depend on ministries and departments.

Consumer Cooperative Expands Rural Amenities*PM1506073790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 13 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast: A. Nugmanova, V. Zhiyakov reportage on Taldy-Kurgan leasehold enterprises]

[Text] [Announcer] The reportage by our own correspondents from Kazakhstan also deals partly with problems and partly with what is being done to resolve them. But has the time not come, both at the center and at local level, to take to task those who do not show enough responsibility for the tasks entrusted to them, who are blighting our life? This probably does not apply to the Consumer Cooperative Association in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast which, in the opinion of the authors of the reportage, is beginning to overcome scornful attitudes to the development of trade in remote villages. It is curious, though, that it has taken this long for people to grasp this necessity.

[Correspondent] Aksu village in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast is located some 200 km from the oblast center—it is the boondocks, in short. [video shows various aspects of the village, stores, local bakery] Only a few years ago villagers were complaining about the unavailability of the most essential food products, even bread. Over the past 10 to 15 years consumer cooperatives were increasingly fleeing the countryside. Bakeries, confectionery shops, major stores were all located in rayon centers. Today the picture is changing. The emergence of leasehold enterprises and rural cooperative procurement centers has made it possible to produce many things locally. There is a small production facility for cooked foods and a meat and dairy product processing shop, each employing only a few people. Fresh bakery products are now delivered regularly. The rural cooperative procurement center buys all surplus produce from the peasants in any quantity. Just like a good housewife, it wastes nothing. Some of the produce is processed immediately into all kind of preserves, salted products, and pickles. Milk is

used to prepare local dishes. People from the rayon center come to enjoy the local ice cream and milk shakes. [video shows ice cream parlor]

[M.S. Khasenov, chairman of the Taldy-Kurgan Oblast Consumer Cooperative Association, identified by caption, facing camera] It may seem difficult to understand, but people are not exactly rushing into leasehold enterprises. We are having difficulty in getting people to take up this opportunity. There is a lot of work to be done in this sphere, persuading people, explaining to them what the prospects are. So far only individual people are interested in leasehold enterprises. People have forgotten how to work on their own, how to act in a proprietary manner.

[Correspondent] But they are beginning to learn?

[M.S. Khasenov] Yes, things are changing, we are setting up small enterprises like these.

[Correspondent] [video shows white Kazakh tent used as a restaurant] The family of Nurzhaim Bayzhumanova [name rendered phonetically] produces good home-cooking. The Kazakhs reserve the white tent for the special guests. This is the welcome accorded to everyone here; they try to create a good atmosphere. And people are flocking in. The upshot is that leasehold means that people take charge and business prospers.

Car Production Slowed by Steel, Plastic Shortages

PM1806131790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by V. Bakarinov and S. Murazov, identified by caption, from the Moscow Lenin Komsomol Motor Vehicle Plant on stoppages due to shortage of metal sheet]

[Text] [Newscaster] This is not the first time that Moscow's Lenin Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Motor Vehicle Plant [AZLK] has been threatened with grinding to a halt. On this occasion it is because metallurgical enterprises have failed to meet the plan for deliveries of steel sheet. "Vremya" newscast correspondents, including myself, have reported critical situations at the AZLK more than once. The situation, if it changed, did not change for long. What needs to be done to improve this state of affairs? Who must take action?

[Correspondent] You will agree, everyone is sick of the subject of shortages. We keep talking about them, and there are more and more of them. [video shows various aspects of the plant] How do they arise? Putting it in simple terms, this is approximately what happens. Today industrial enterprises are clamoring for raw materials and components, and if they do not get them, we register the disappearance of yet another article from store shelves tomorrow. Take cars, for instance. They cannot be compared with sausage, of course. But for people who

wait for years to be able to buy a car, it is probably interesting to see how a car is born.

A clever machine [video shows body stamping machine]. If metal sheet is placed on it, it sets itself in operation; if there is no metal, it stands still. Obviously, the enterprise's profits depend on how much it operates. This production line has been out of operation for more than two weeks.

[V.I. Lepinin, chief of the AZLK metal supply administration, identified by caption, facing camera] Deliveries of metal from metallurgical combines are very poor at the moment. That's first. And second, there is no imported metal.

[Correspondent] Production lines are operating, but not at full capacity. More and more often we see red and yellow lights flashing, which means a halt in operations.

The problem with metal is not the only one at the enterprise.

[Yu.V. Gayetskiy, chief of the plant's material and technical supply administration, identified by caption, facing camera] The Bank for Foreign Economic Relations has stopped payments, and foreign companies have halted their deliveries of plastic raw materials. We have now found a temporary solution which will enable us to buy 1.5 million rubles' worth of materials. However, that is sufficient only for four to six weeks.

[Correspondent] I recall the end of last year, when the AZLK failed to deliver a large number of cars to trade outlets. Could that happen this year again?

[Yu.V. Gayetskiy] Quite easily.

[Correspondent] I do not know what the situation is like on the assembly line. But here the last parts, rear wings, are being pressed.

[Newscaster] Yet the plant's stoppage for just one day costs the state more than R2.5 million. Not to mention eager buyers who are ready to spend this money right now.

Liquor Plant's Successful Conversion Profiled

PM1306111590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by S. Veto-shkin, V. Privezentsev, identified by caption, from Pokrovskiy Food Combine in Vladimir Oblast]

[Text] [Newscaster] It seems to happen in our society that, when we launch a campaign, we usually go over the top. You will recall that recently an all-out anti-alcohol war was declared, and thousands of hectares of vineyards were axed. Now we have swung to the other extreme: We repent, and claim that the whole campaign against drunkenness was a mistake from start to finish. Well,

that is not true either. Take a look at how a food industry enterprise in Vladimir Oblast benefited from the campaign.

[Correspondent] There is truth in the saying that it is an ill wind that blows nobody any good. There was no reason for the Pokrovskiy Food Combine to be keen on developing production and mastering new types of output if "bormotukha" [cheap alcohol made from berry residue] alone brought in R4.5 million in profit annually. [video shows bottle production line]

Then in 1986, when this living-giving source dried up, the Pokrovskiy Food Combine workers began to display such entrepreneurial talents that they now have no equal in the entire RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Consumer Cooperatives. Condensed milk, smoked sausage, delicious candies, and spiced cakes which literally melt in the mouth—this is what this collective is now famous for. [video shows output] And with the commissioning of the new confectionery factory—incidentally, it was originally conceived for the production of the aforementioned "bormotukha"—and a major meat processing complex bought from the FRG, output will run into tens of thousands of tonnes.

[Interviewer] From other food industry workers we hear nothing but complaints about the lack of raw materials, lack of equipment, and absence of construction quotas, yet you manage to commission several new production facilities a year. At the moment you are getting ready to commission a whole big confectionery factory. How do you manage?

[P.A. Komarov, director of the Pokrovskiy Food Combine, identified by caption, facing camera with new factory in the background] Because we do everything ourselves, basically with our own resources. We have our own, relatively strong construction department, we are establishing our own production base, we even have a brickworks. We do not produce many bricks—just enough for our own needs.

[Correspondent] Where do you get the specialized equipment?

[P.A. Komarov] That is a question that can be resolved. The Vladimir "Tochmash" [precision engineering] plant produces automated production lines for us.

[Correspondent] To your orders?

[P.A. Komarov] To our orders. A number of orders have also been placed with the Stavrovo road-building machinery plant.

[Correspondent] All problems can be resolved when tackled resourcefully and purposefully, as is the case at the Pokrovskiy Food Combine. Although, to be fair, it must be noted that any agreement with machine builders is costing the cooperative members tremendous efforts which would be better employed on their main line of business.

Aviation Minister Approves Kamchatka Airline Plan

PM1906104790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: V. Plotskiy reportage on problems in switching Kamchatka Civil Aviation Production Association to self-financing, including interview with B.Ye. Panyukov, USSR Minister of Civil Aviation]

[Text] [Correspondent] With the switch of the [Civil Aviation] sector to economic accountability, the former Kamchatka Production Association, which consisted of three relatively independent aviation detachments, underwent major structural changes and ended up even more dependent on the Far East Civil Aviation Administration. Its position is further complicated by the antiquated aircraft in use in Kamchatka. What can be done? How can this acute situation be resolved? [video shows various aspects of airport, passengers boarding an Il-62 M]

As long as two years ago the idea was put forward of establishing a separate airline, that is, a completely independent association which would be able to stand on its own feet, so to speak, sharply improve flight safety, and also improve the quality of air travel.

The plan for the establishment of such an association, which had been carefully thought out and elaborated in detail, ran into a wall of misunderstanding, not to say opposition, on the part of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and the Far East Civil Aviation Administration. An agreement, albeit a verbal one, to set up an airline in Kamchatka has now emerged between the top leadership of the relevant organizations as the outcome of the paper battles which have been waged over the past year between these organizations and the Kamchatka Aviation Enterprise.

It must be mentioned here that the Ministry of Civil Aviation has been trying to run Kamchatka Civil Aviation mainly by telephone and teleprinter from Moscow. For the first time in 20 years a USSR Minister of Civil Aviation has come to Kamchatka.

Boris Yegorovich, what is your attitude to the establishment of an airline in Kamchatka?

[B.Ye. Panyukov, USSR minister of civil aviation, identified by caption, facing camera, interviewed on the tarmac] My attitude is positive. Let the local aviators take speedy and vigorous steps in this direction, and we will back them up.

[Correspondent] I have another question. You know what the North is like. Yet our aircraft are nothing to boast of. When are we likely to receive new equipment?

[B.Ye. Panyukov] That is a more difficult question to answer. In general we are experiencing great difficulties in this area. We are hoping that, in connection with the implementation of the conversion plan, deliveries of new

aircraft equipment will increase. Then we can look to the fulfillment of the plans for the 13th Five Year Plan. I cannot be more specific now.

Vorkuta Coal Chief Rebuts Miners' Complaint

PM1406153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[A. Tretyakov report: "The Ultimatum and the Reality"]

[Text] Vorkuta—A state-public commission for monitoring the progress of the fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608 has begun work in Vorkuta.

The conclusions of the commission as to how the agreement between the miners and the government is being fulfilled will perhaps help to remove the internal tension in which this polar city is living.

An impression of what the situation here is like can be gathered, for example, from an interview in the 9 June "Vremya" program. V. Tukan, a Vorkuta City soviet deputy, and V. Kopasov, first deputy chairman of the city soviet—before his election to this post he was leader of the city workers' (strike) committee—informed viewers that coal shipments out of Vorkuta were being mismanaged and that, if stockpiles were not reduced to the norm by 1 July, the miners would carry out their conference decision and strike.

This conference took place in April. At that time the "Vorkutaugol" association had more than 900,000 tonnes of coal stockpiled—three times the norm. This was partly the consequence of a snowstorm which lasted many days and disrupted the operation of the Northern Railroad.

But was everything really just the same by the day that the television interview was broadcast? "Vorkutaugol" Association Production Director V. Golikov replies to this question.

"Half a million tonnes remain stockpiled," he reported. "This includes 90,000 tonnes of unprocessed power-station coal destined for local use, piled up at the 'Yuzhnaya' mine. Every 24 hours we are receiving up to 800 cars from the railroad workers. Some mines are already having difficulty filling this mighty torrent of empty rolling stock. They have coal reserves stockpiled at or below the norm. And "Vorgashorskaya," for instance, is not releasing surplus coal now because it is stockpiling to fulfill the third-quarter plan."

Miners Vote To Establish Independent Union

PM1806140390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Nikolay Lisovenko report under "Direct Line" rubric: "There Will Be a New Trade Union"]

[Text] Donetsk—Of the 593 delegates who attended the miners' congress, 330 have voted for the establishment of a new independent miners' trade union.

Some 2.5 million people are currently employed in the country's coal mining sector. All of them, both workers and employers, are members of the one trade union, despite the fact that their interests are diametrically opposed: While the former seek to obtain as much as possible for their labor, the latter want to pay them as little as possible. This is a logic which the administrative-command system that used to operate in our country long refused to acknowledge.

Speakers unanimously demanded that the new trade union be relieved of the unfortunate necessity to distribute housing and cars and of other routine work, to enable it to devote itself to the protection of its working people's rights.

In accordance with the standing orders 15 June is the last day of the miners' congress. On that day the most important documents of the forum of the country's miners are to be adopted.

Strikes Blamed for Railroad Punctuality Decline

PM1806161790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by V. Bakarinov and A. Arbuzov, identified by caption, on railroad summer passenger service problems, including interview with V.N. Ginko, USSR deputy minister of railways]

[Text] [Announcer] We return to our country's problems. The beginning of the summer is also the beginning of the vacation season, the beginning of problems in the transport sphere. The railroads have switched to their summer schedule. Will it resolve passengers' problems? Our correspondents report:

[Correspondent] What is the purpose of the summer train schedule? It is an effort to cope with an increase from nine million to 12 million passengers per day. [video shows crowds at a railroad station, passenger trains, computerized ticket selling offices] In order to ensure the transportation of this quantity of passengers, railroad workers are increasing the number of cars per train and putting on additional trains. "Ground services" are also being improved. For instance, there will be some 1,500 ticket vending points more than usual in the country's cities and population centers. However, is this enough to ensure that trains run smoothly and on time?

For six months now trains have been arriving late at Moscow railroad stations. Is this actually the fault of the Ministry of Railways alone?

[V.N. Ginko, USSR first deputy minister of railways, identified by caption] Unfortunately, we have been trying to improve the situation on the railroads for a long

time without success. We are short of rails, ties, and switch equipment. And this situation is not likely to improve even in the longer term. Naturally, we do not reject our own share of responsibility.

Unfortunately, another unexpected factor has emerged: Many events currently taking place in the country are also affecting railroad transport. [video shows crowded railroad station, passengers seeking information, stationary train]

[Correspondent] The deputy minister is referring to the strikes which have, with increasing frequency, blocked the railroads in Georgia and the western Ukraine. For instance, one such strike on the Kuybyshev Railroad the day before yesterday delayed 60 percent of trains by several hours.

[Correspondent] Do the people who organize these strikes not understand that by these methods they are simply trying to resolve their own questions, regional questions, at the expense of the people marooned on trains, people who, for one reason or another, are forced to travel?

[V.N. Ginko] For that very reason I would like to take the opportunity of this interview, this broadcast, to appeal on behalf of the Ministry of Railways and all the railroad workers to everyone, all the citizens of our country not to inflict on railroad transport their quarrels in connection with any problems they may have with whatever departments or organizations.

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts To Conduct Scientific Experiments

LD1806130390 Moscow World Service in English
1100 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] the two Soviet cosmonauts manning the Mir orbiting station will be conducting complicated experiments on the technological module which has been recently linked up with the orbital station. Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin have been checking on the systems of the module which makes it possible to carry out research in the interests of science and the national economy on a much bigger scale. The cosmonauts are beginning to test methods of (?receiving) in conditions of weightlessness unique semiconductors for electronics and using the (?Krapar) device for that purpose. And in the green house Svet they will study the best ways of growing plants also in the state of weightlessness. Besides, there will be experiments with protein substances in order to produce super-pure vaccines for medicine.

Space Biology Conference Opens in Kaluga

LD1806163590 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Solianikov]

[Text] Kaluga June 18 TASS—A national scientific conference on space biology and medicine opened in Kaluga (180 kilometers south of Moscow) today. The conference is attended by leading specialists from other countries, including the United States, Canada and France. Soviet cosmonauts are taking part in the conference.

Kaluga was chosen as the venue to commemorate the father of theoretical cosmonautics, Konstantin Tsiolkovsky (1857-1935) and one of the founders of heliobiology Aleksandr Chizhevskiy (1897-1964), who lived in this city.

The scientists are expected to chart ways for further research. Soviet and American specialists will hold a roundtable discussion about an expedition to Mars.

An exhibition displays R-and-D achievements of space science and technology that have found extensive application in practical medicine—new preparations and methods of treatment, appliances and instruments.

Military

Lopatin Comments on Military Reform, Conversion

90UM0642A Moscow NEDELYA in Russian
No 22, 28 May 90 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Major Vladimir Lopatin, USSR people's deputy, by S. Aleksandrov; place, date not specified: "To Serve the People and Not Parties"]

[Text] [Aleksandrov] Why did it become necessary to change the tuned-up mechanism of the military machine?

[Lopatin] It is only in songs and in past reports of Ministry of Defense leaders that the Army is strong and the "tanks are swift." But in reality, in the Army as in the entire society, the crisis is accelerating. These are its symptoms: In peacetime several thousand servicemen die every year. Up to 20 percent of them, according to sociologists' data, end their life in suicide. Cases of desertion have become more frequent. Last year 6,000 young men were charged with evasion of military service, and this is five times more than in 1988. Crime is growing in the Army. Its exact dimensions are still kept a secret, but as a deputy I can say that in 1989 alone the USSR Supreme Soviet reviewed about 70 cases on depriving servicemen of their decorations after they committed crimes.

And here are several more figures which I think will come as a surprise to many. According to last year's data, 45 percent of the conscripts in our 4-million-man Army are people with various mental aberrations. Fifteen percent have criminal records. This is to whom we entrust weapons in the drive for numerical strength. One-third of the conscripts almost have no command of the Russian language—the language of directives! This is 12 times more than in 1969. If we retain the former

system of manpower acquisition, then by the year 2000, in the opinion of scientists, half of all our soldiers will not understand Russian. How can an army like this be commanded?

[Aleksandrov] The army becomes unmanageable.... This, Vladimir Nikolayevich, is frightening to hear.

[Lopatin] It is possible, of course, to assuage oneself with the hope of the success of our foreign policy and a decrease in the military threat. But what is really frightening is the unmanageable and uncontrolled growth in military expenditures. The appetites of the military industrial complex, as it becomes clear, have not decreased, despite the warming in the international atmosphere. How much do we spend on military needs? It is said that in 1989, R70 billion were "eaten up." Is that so? Recently Marshal Akhromeyev could not give a U.S. congressman even an approximate figure of military expenditures. And it is hardly likely that he knows and is hiding it. The fact is that the resources of the military budget are spread out among the hands of dozens of ministries that have a tie to the military-industrial complex. And where are the expenditures of the Union republics and local authorities for the maintenance of garrisons accounted for? Or the defense expenditures of enterprises (this includes both the establishment of a system of defense and the detachment of workers for periodic training with the continuation of average wages)? We mention also the military training of pupils and students. And it turns out that all of this is not taken into account anywhere.

At a meeting of our commission a Ministry of Defense representative talked about annual military expenditures of R120 billion. Three months ago in the journal *NOVOYE VREMYA* the figure of R200 billion was cited. Aside from everything else, this "fog" creates favorable opportunities for abuses. Because also not taken into account are the incomes of the Ministry of Defense that are received from, let us say, military *sovkhozes* [state farms] or military workshops.

[Aleksandrov] It seems that the slogan of defense sufficiency has been articulated, but in fact reasonable state regulation of military expenditures is impossible?

[Lopatin] Our group of deputy-officers believes that the forthcoming military reform must turn over all resources to one pair of hands—the Ministry of Defense. It will play the role of both customer and consumer of military equipment. Then the state also will be able to monitor and regulate the military budget in accordance with the level of defense sufficiency and the real capabilities of the country.

But for the major officials of the military industry, this step means giving up unlimited authority. Will they accept this voluntarily? Probably not. There is strong opposition to reform from here, where everything is set in motion.

It happens that we are simply being deceived. Take such an important matter as the conversion of the capacities of military plants to the output of civilian products. For two years already the people have been fed stories about conversion. But what are the facts? It became apparent that there was practically no so-called "conversion." The increase in output of civilian products in the military complex was obtained due to the resubordination to it of enterprises of the light and food industries. This is eyewash. But this is not all. The management of the military-industrial complex recently demanded that the USSR Supreme Soviet earmark R63 billion allegedly for the conversion of defense capacities to the output of consumer goods. However, it turned out that R13 billion will go directly for these purposes. Why then another R50 billion? It seems for the construction of civilian plants under the aegis of the military department. This will bring the people new hardships: This kind of production will be significantly more expensive than the usual production.

[Aleksandrov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, the economic prerequisites for the coming military reforms are more or less obvious. But, apparently, the deputy group of officers has other considerations regarding the reconstruction of the Soviet military machine?

[Lopatin] These are considerations of a political nature. Remember: There are 10 years between the introduction of troops into Afghanistan and the Tbilisi tragedy. But the mechanism of employing the Army for political purposes remains as before. Now the Army is commanded by the Supreme Soviet and by the president of the USSR personally. However, the CPSU Central Committee headed by the Politburo remains the real administrator of the Armed Forces. Why? There are weighty reasons for this. All of the military managers, beginning with the commander of a division and above, are approved by the Central Committee. For an officer to advance in the service requires not so much professionalism as membership in the party and personal loyalty to the CPSU leadership.

It seems to me that it is necessary to eliminate the party structures in the Army. The Armed Forces must serve the people, and not parties. And that is to say: Various political organizations are cropping up everywhere now. Servicemen also join them. It follows that the Army risks transforming itself into an arena of political passions. This is intolerable. In the United States, for example, servicemen do not have the right to belong to one or another party. In the FRG military personnel can engage in political activity only during nonservice time....

[Aleksandrov] As is known, at the third USSR Congress of People's Deputies you came out for the retirement of the present leadership of the Ministry of Defense. Why this rejection with respect to the supreme command?

[Lopatin] It is my conviction that new people should stand at the head of reform activity. The more so because we are approaching still another side of reform—moral

reform. According to the data of our deputy commission and also of the USSR People's Control Committee, many military ranks, alas, abuse their positions. Thus, four higher military leaders built country cottages for themselves near Moscow at the expense of the state at a cost of more than half a million rubles each. But only R40 thousand is allowed. Where did they get the rest? From other items of expenditure of the Ministry of Defense. Meanwhile, in our garrison no kindergartens have been built for the 800 children of servicemen. We asked our own ministry for help and we got the answer: There is no money for you.

Improved housing conditions are needed by 280,000 service families. The ministry ignores their disastrous situation. Soon the number of those who are not set up will increase—a massive withdrawal of troops from foreign territories is coming. Are we ready to receive them, and to set them up. We are not ready. This means social tension will grow in the Army. And in the Army any tension is intolerable, for these are people with weapons.

[Aleksandrov] How is the Ministry of Defense reacting?

[Lopatin] Here is how: It was decided to put the housing problem in the hands of the local soviets. But even without this, there are enough priorities everywhere. This means that the Army is once more set off against the people.

Social questions in the Army have to be resolved not at the expense of the people but at the expense of the military budget. To do this it is not necessary to increase it, but only to redistribute the resources.

How is our military budget expended? Forty-four percent goes for equipment, and only 26 percent goes to personnel support (in the United States, more than half of military expenditures go to personnel support). Incidentally, the level of expenditure on a serviceman also determines his professionalism. The main point of the reforms we propose is also to have a smaller army of a better quality.

[Aleksandrov] Do you believe that it will be possible in the near future to shift the Army to a professional footing? Many people's deputies are talking about this....

[Lopatin] Nothing is that simple of course. The change, in my opinion, in any case will be gradual. At the beginning noncommissioned officer personnel and technical specialists from among the compulsory service personnel will have to be converted to a professional status. Also the most prestigious and technically equipped types of Armed Forces and branches of troops. In the transition period, according to our concept, there will be a mixed method of manpower acquisition for the Armed Forces—a combination of voluntary enlistment in the Army on a contractual basis for a period of up to five years and the conscription of citizens to perform service according to a territorial principle. But also the

opportunity to choose alternative service (work on construction jobs and in enterprises). Within the next few years we must arrive at a professional volunteer army. I am confident that the volunteer principle of manpower acquisition (with a good salary) will only increase the combat capability of the Armed Forces. An incentive will develop to master combat skills. In the 1920s Frunze started military reform in those years specifically with an increase in monetary pay for all personnel of the Armed Forces.

And the problem with discipline will be resolved. This is shown by the example of the United States. There, the volunteer principle was introduced in 1973, and in the succeeding 17 years crime in the Army dropped by 70 percent.

[Aleksandrov] As is known, the flower of any army is its officer corps. What do you have to say about the qualification level of Soviet officers?

[Lopatin] Last year, according to data of operational inspections, the qualification of 40 percent of our officers was evaluated only as "satisfactory." And this is as it should be. Twice a year commanders receive replacement recruits—and they teach them the same thing over and over. Naturally, officers do not have the time to raise their own professional level. This is one more flaw in the current system of compulsory manning of the Army. By the way, do you recall the loss of the submarine "Komsomolets?" I went to the unit [soyedeniye]. They agreed there with the conclusions of the state commission investigating the cause of the accident: The employment of compulsory service personnel on such complex equipment is not advisable. Professionals are needed.

[Aleksandrov] Apparently those working on the draft of the reform are thinking not only of the military aspects but also of the legal aspects of the future restructuring of the Armed Forces?

[Lopatin] This is also a burning question. Today four laws are in force that have a bearing on the Army. These are the fifth chapter of the USSR Constitution, the Law on Universal Military Training, the Law on Criminal Responsibility for Military Crimes, and the recently adopted Law on Pensions for Servicemen. The rest are directions and instructions.

[Aleksandrov] And regulations?...

[Lopatin] Excuse me, these are not law. Of course, they state that the order of a commander is the law for a subordinate. But where is the limitation on the authority of a commander? Is it incumbent on a subordinate to execute an order that is inhumane or that contradicts common sense? According to regulations, he is bound to do so. Thus, it is time legislatively to formulate a legal basis for the activity of servicemen—what is prohibited, what must absolutely be executed, and what is allowed. Military tribunals must be replaced by courts, and the accused must be permitted to bring in a professional

lawyer for his defense. And all servicemen must know their rights—for this we are proposing to introduce a legal service into units that is independent of the command authorities.

And less indoctrination. We now have thousands of political workers of various ranks. Why so many? We are proposing to retrain part of them for other very necessary Army specialties: lawyers, sociologists, and psychologists. It is time to put self-education in first place and to respect the individuality of the soldier.

[Aleksandrov] The last question, Vladimir Nikolayevich. It is known that you were expelled from the party in April, and that you were restored to its ranks by a decision of a party commission under the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy. How do you assess what happened?

[Lopatin] I was extremely surprised when I heard about the hasty decision of the party organization where I was registered to expel me from the CPSU. And I directly associate this step with the fact that several collectives nominated me to take part in the forthcoming 28th CPSU Congress. What happened to me is the usual attempt of the conservatives to get rid of candidates for delegate to the congress who are objectionable. This means that the military partocracy does not intend to yield its positions. So we will fight.

Military Academy Officer on Military Reform

OW1706044690 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0200 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] The USSR is about to undergo military reforms largely related to maintaining an effective national defense at a minimum cost; the size, strength, and structure of the Armed Forces; the standardization of soldiers' life; and the evaluation of the functions of political organs in the Armed Forces.

Right now, there are a lot of arguments on ways to implement the military reforms, with different plans being put forward. Our reporter (Hevolar) talks to Colonel (Chelefunyev) from the senior military academy in [word indistinct]. The most acute arguments deal with the question of the criteria for the selection of military personnel. Some advocate a career military system, while others favor the retention of national military service for all.

In response to this question, Col. (Chelefunyev) said: All the time I have been advocating the establishment of a career military system. I am convinced that only career military personnel can raise the quality of the Armed Forces. To establish a career military system on the existing basis is not a new idea. Nearly 60 countries have adopted this system.

Those who oppose this idea hold that the expenditure for a career military system is too large. Col. (Chelefunyev) said that statements of this nature are exaggerated. First,

the number of career military personnel is much fewer, yet fighting capacity is in no way weakened. At present, many military personnel are not deployed in military duty but engaged in economic work under the economic department, including work under the [word indistinct] department. Second, we can save a lot in military technological expenditure and use it for rewarding labor rendered by military personnel. [words indistinct] Third, expenditure will be curtailed by reducing the number of management organs of the military forces and that of military academies. According to my estimates, expenditure for our national defense will not be increased very much by adopting a career military system. However, the quality of the forces will be much better. As we all are aware, the efficiency of labor is better if the labor is not forced, and there is no exception in the military.

Another question is whether it is necessary to have political organs in the Armed Forces. Col. (Chelefunyev) said: Their functions should be drastically changed, especially now when there are a number of political parties in existence. I believe that political organs in the Armed Forces should concentrate more on the task of improving the social security of military personnel and the work of enhancing their cultural and educational standards, which is an area which has no limits.

Armed Forces Reform Program To Be Televised

PM1506105190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

[Announcement: "TV: Talk on Military Reform"]

[Text] A recording of the television program "Reform in the Armed Forces" will be made on 16 June this year at 1500 hours (Moscow time). Taking part in the program are ranking personnel of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and people's deputies.

Those wishing to ask questions can telephone 217-84-55 and 215-89-47 from 1000 hours, or 215-81-47, 215-93-65, and 215-89-47 (studio) from 1400 hours.

The broadcast will go on the air 24 June this year.

Payment Sought for Army Property in Hungary

PM1806123990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

["Interview on a Topical Theme" with Major General V. Rudakov, deputy commander of the Southern Group of Forces for Construction and Billeting of Troops, by Southern Group of Forces correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovkov: "Who Is Going To Pay?"]

[Text] Southern Group of Forces—This question is increasingly cropping up in the course of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungarian territory. Who gets paid for the facilities Soviet servicemen are vacating and handing over to the Hungarian side and when? After all, experts estimate that the facilities constructed here on

the basis of USSR Defense Ministry funds are worth around 50 billion forints. A considerable sum, you will agree, when you consider that the Soviet units and subunits that are being withdrawn to USSR territory are in dire need of amenities. But where will the money come from?

Are our people to pay twice for this?

This matter must be cleared up. Particularly as it has been raised several times in the Soviet media. In particular, on one television program the USSR Defense Ministry was criticized for allegedly failing to stipulate the payment of compensation by the Hungarian side for any facilities left behind. What is the actual state of affairs?

Statements by Hungarian leadership representatives essentially suggest that "accounts have been squared": That is, after the complete withdrawal of our troops from Hungary no one should claim compensation. This is hardly going to suit the Soviet Armed Forces or our country as a whole, particularly in the present situation. Your Southern Group of Forces correspondent talked about it with Major General V. Rudakov, deputy commander of the Southern Group of Forces for construction and billeting of troops.

[Borovkov] Vladimir Alekseyevich, the Southern Group of Forces command, in implementing the planned withdrawal of units and subunits from Hungarian territory, has already handed over to the Hungarian side eight military installations along with all the facilities in them.

[Rudakov] The latest action of this kind took place recently near the city of Veszprem in the presence of foreign attaches, representatives of the local leadership, and a large number of correspondents. L. Horvath, deputy chairman of the Veszprem City Council, said that "the military installation has been handed over in splendid condition." The same can be said of the apartments left behind by the servicemen's families. As a matter of fact, that has generally been the case. What compensation have we received for the facilities and housing which were constructed here using USSR Defense Ministry funds?

None as yet, and we find this very worrying. To make the situation perfectly clear, I will cite the following facts.

Under the 27 May 1957 and 1 April 1958 intergovernmental agreement between our countries "On the Legal Status of Soviet Forces Temporarily Stationed on Hungarian Territory," which clarifies all economic, legal, and property and financial questions, we had the right to construct our own facilities—in addition to leasing facilities. Over the years we have spent money on constructing 378 and leasing 1,900 premises totaling 8.7 million and 6.5 million square meters respectively. We constructed 14,350 of the 16,700 apartments for servicemen's families. As you can appreciate, a considerable amount of money was spent on this.

According to the same documents, the Soviet forces' expenditure on the restoration and capital and running repair of these facilities is regarded as payment for the leased facilities. I will say here that world practice also shows that expenditure on the upkeep and repair of leased facilities always far exceeds the rental. And the conditions in which we have left our facilities for the Hungarian side to take over was well illustrated by the recent example of the Veszprem garrison.

[Borovkov] On 10 March our governments signed yet another agreement on the timeframe and procedure for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungarian territory. Did it incorporate economic and property and financial questions?

[Rudakov] The Southern Group of Forces command carried out a meticulous study of the situation and prepared detailed proposals on controversial economic questions for the draft agreement. We insisted on their inclusion in the text of the agreement, since we knew that this would eventually be a stumbling block in the process of the withdrawal of forces. The withdrawal timeframe is not satisfactory either as far as we are concerned. It is affecting literally everything at the moment—the strain is enormous. But the agreement, specifically Article 7, clearly states: "Property and financial and other economic questions connected with the withdrawal of forces and not regulated by existing agreements will be regulated by special accords. The sides will take steps to achieve such accords as soon as possible, bearing in mind that the aforementioned questions must be solved before the withdrawal of Soviet forces is complete." We are now seeing the Hungarian side's reaction to this. How many times have we proposed payment for the facilities that have been handed over—all we get in response is either silence or counterclaims, in some cases nonsensical ones.

[Borovkov] What do you mean?

[Rudakov] Take the installations the Soviet forces left behind last year and handed over to the Hungarian side in proper condition. The Hungarians have been unable to ensure their proper protection or maintenance—they have neither the manpower nor the money. Now they are claiming that the facilities smashed up and plundered in the meantime were handed over in that dismal condition. The Hungarian press has been quick to pick up and amplify this theme. It is understandable: Why should anyone pay in this case?

[Borovkov] Vladimir Alekseyevich, I have heard about the intention to include compensation for our facilities in the Soviet Union's foreign debt payments to Hungary.

[Rudakov] Indeed, the State Planning Committee and the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations are insisting that the total value of the constructed facilities should be included in our foreign debt account. But, in the first place, although this debt is regarded as a state debt, it was created not by the state, but by departments and enterprises that have failed to fulfill contracts or have

been late fulfilling them. The specific culprits must be brought to book. Why should the Defense Ministry pay someone else's debts? Second, the real estate we intend to use to pay off our foreign economic debts is state property, and selling it has always been regarded as disadvantageous for the state. In that case, it would be better to place it in the hands of our organizations and enterprises. However, in either case the USSR Armed Forces will be deprived of these facilities, which are so essential at the moment in terms of solving the very difficult task of providing amenities for the troops who are being withdrawn to the territory of the Soviet Union. This brings up once again a difficult question in the present situation: Who is going to pay?

USSR Servicemen Honored With Valor Awards

*PM1406150590 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun
in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 1*

[USSR Presidential Decree: "On the Award of USSR Orders and Medals to USSR Armed Forces Servicemen"]

[Text] For courage and valor displayed in minesweeping and disarming explosive devices the following awards are made:

Order of the Red Star to:

Senior Warrant Officer Vladimir Mitrofanovich Dzhugoshtan
Lieutenant Colonel Aleksandr Borisovich Zudin
Captain Vladimir Nikolayevich Kuleshov

Captain Andrey Valerianovich Spirin
Major Mikhail Yuryevich Yakovlev

Order "For Services to the Motherland in the USSR Armed Forces" Third Class to:

Major Vladimir Ivanovich Volkoyedov
Major Arkadiy Petrovich Ivanov
Major Nikolay Ivanovich Yurchenko
Major Ildus Kutuzovich Yarmukhametov

"For Valor" Medal to:

Major Valeriy Fedorovich Zabolotnev

"For Combat Services" Medal to:

Private Ilkhomzhon Abdumanapovich Ablayev
Junior Sergeant Vladimir Vladimirovich Averin
Private Konstantin Mikhaylovich Balaban
Senior Lieutenant Vladimir Stanislavovich Baranovskiy
Captain Igor Ivanovich Baturin
Captain Nikolay Yegorovich Bukreyev
Captain Aleksandr Petrovich Yemelyanov
Major Vladimir Ivanovich Ivanov
Private Andrey Georgiyevich Kroitor
Captain Valeriy Alekseyevich Peremibed
Major Valeriy Veniaminovich Rachev
Senior Lieutenant Aleksandr Nikolayevich Snezhko
Captain Sergey Iosifovich Starozhitnik
Senior Lieutenant Valeriy Uzbekovich Syundyukov
Captain Pavel Gennadyevich Talyanov
Warrant Officer Mikhail Ivanovich Taranko
Private Radik Faritovich Bakhretidinov
Private Leonid Prokopyevich Chankov [Signed] USSR
President M. Gorbachev
Moscow, The Kremlin. 11 June 1990

Baltic Republics**Supreme Soviet Not To Consider Moratorium***LD1806181190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received another report: During the coming days, at plenary meetings of the Supreme Soviet session, it is not planned to consider the proposal by the government of Lithuania to the Supreme Soviet to discuss the possibilities for declaring a temporary moratorium of the act of 11 March this year—on restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state—for the period of talks with the USSR. This became clear today, when a TASS correspondent met the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, Landsbergis.

Supreme Council Commissions View Moratorium*LD1806193690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1816 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustisla]

[Text] Vilnius, 18 Jun—Today deputies in commissions of the Lithuanian Supreme Council started discussing the republican government's proposal on a possibility of "declaring a temporary moratorium for the period of negotiations with the USSR on 11 March act restoring an independent Lithuanian state."

Many people in Lithuania have been awaiting this day with impatience and the hope that a way out of the impasse would be found at last. For it is precisely today, after publication of the governmental legislative initiative, that it was announced that the parliament has to start examining this issue.

The Lithuanian government's proposal to the republican Supreme Council, however, is not due for examination at the session's plenary meetings in the next few days. This became clear during a meeting between the TASS correspondent and V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. In his words, "the option put forward by the government can be accepted as one of the possible formulas and as a subject for discussion." He drew attention to the fact that "preparation is required for examining such an important issue. The public has to be prepared, too, for discussing it. People are regarding the moratorium with apprehension, and their opinion should be taken into account."

There is hardly a shortage of opinions. If some people met the government's initiative with relief, others oppose it adamantly. Already today people carrying such banners as "No to the moratorium" and the like stood outside the Supreme Council.

The Vilnius City Sajudis council called on all its supporters who disagree with the government proposal to picket the Supreme Council tomorrow.

Government Proposal for 'Moratorium' Noted*LD1906102390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0710 GMT 19 Jun 90*

[Remarks by Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] A letter addressed to us has been received. It says: To the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. The date is 16 June. Today we have gathered here for a sitting; therefore I have to formally acquaint you with the letter, although I think we all have heard and seen it on television, so the contents of this letter are known to all of us. Nevertheless, I shall read it to you:

To the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania:

Further steps for the reinforcement of Lithuanian statehood were discussed by the government of Lithuania at a sitting which took place on 16 June, 1990.

Being convinced that at the moment it is necessary to take specific decisions in order to start negotiations with the USSR, the government of Lithuania asks the Supreme Council to discuss the following decision which could be adopted:

Decision of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. The Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania declares a temporary moratorium on the period of negotiations with the Soviet Union on the act adopted by the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania on 11 March, 1990 concerning the restoration of the independent state of Lithuania.

The government draws the attention of the Supreme Council that the concept of moratorium which had been used in the draft decision is, in the government's opinion, the most acceptable term and was used in order to preserve the validity of the Independence Act; the explanation of the term will be presented to the public. Such an explanation could serve in shaping public opinion which would be favorable to the possible decisions the Supreme Council would adopt.

Signed by Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania.

Moscow To Restore Gas Supply to Lithuanian Plant*AU1506151890 Paris AFP in English 1410 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow, June 15 (AFP)—The Soviet Union will supply the Lithuanian Azotas fertilizer factory with 3.5 million cubic meters (124 million cubic feet) of natural gas a day starting on Saturday, First Deputy Premier Yuriy Maslyukov said here Friday.

The Azotas factory, in Ionava, central Lithuania, is among the Soviet Union's biggest fertilizer plants.

Mr. Maslyukov told a news conference that the restoration of gas for the plant was a "goodwill gesture, a re-affirmation by the government that it wants to speed up the process leading to negotiations" on the Lithuanian declaration of independence from the Soviet Union.

The minister added that the decision had been made at the request of Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene.

The official Soviet news agency TASS announced on Wednesday that Moscow had agreed to a partial lifting of the economic blockade against Lithuania, imposed on April 19 in reaction to the Baltic republic's declaration of independence.

But TASS did not announce a resumption of natural gas deliveries in its Wednesday report.

Antiblockade Commission Views Energy Situation

LD1806155790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0900 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Report by correspondent Vitas Usas]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Deputy Prime Minister Brazauskas chaired today's meeting of the government's commission to counter the blockade.

Liquid gas supplies from the Soviet Union are arriving in designated amounts and on quite a regular basis. However, there have been no deliveries of crude oil and diesel fuel, in spite of the fact that direct agreements do exist. Apparently, even some of our well-intentioned neighbors are fulfilling their own requirements with difficulty.

Yet, the signal is serious—fuel reserves in the collective farms could run out totally, before the harvest, at the beginning of July.

However, I also heard some good news at the meeting. Agreement has been reached with one USSR republic to exchange lubricants for butter and meat. This shortage is already causing serious concern among transport workers and machine operators.

Another topic discussed today was how to utilize the potential of union-jurisdiction heavy-machine building enterprises in fulfilling Lithuania's vital needs. Administrators of some enterprises are prepared to begin immediate production of machine parts for agricultural equipment. [passage omitted]

The enterprises located in Lithuania could also produce certain types of equipment for use by the forestry and food industries.

An offer was made by the Agricultural Supply (?Committee) representative to organize, in a week's time, a small exhibit of spare parts that are most seriously lacking and to invite administrators of major Lithuanian enterprises to view it. Following agreement between all

concerned, production managers will be provided with actual plans and specifications.

In closing, I would like to note that today marks the beginning of the third month of the blockade—the 61st day. It seems to me that Lithuania is determined to withstand it.

Landsbergis Discusses Economic Blockade, Yeltsin

AU1206093690 Vienna PROFIL in German
11 Jun 90 p 52

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Kerstin Witt; place and date not given: "Gasoline Spilt"]

[Text] [Witt] Mr. President Landsbergis, is there any indication that Moscow will give in and ease the blockade?

[Landsbergis] There are no indications that Moscow will break off the blockade. On the contrary, it reacts with irritation to every attempt by Lithuania to get things into the country. As the railroad lines are blocked for us, we tried to transport gasoline on the roads. Now the trucks with the gasoline bought by us are standing behind the Polish border. Oil which we bought in Belorussia is simply spilt. They treat us as if there were war. For this is actually an economic war against a small state.

[Witt] Can you imagine that the Lithuanians might one day say that they will give up?

[Landsbergis] I do not believe that we will give up. They cannot achieve our capitulation by legal means.

[Witt] You met Boris Yeltsin in Moscow. What is your impression of him?

[Landsbergis] I had the impression that he has a clear position. He knows what he wants, that is, Russia's sovereignty. The future depends on this idea.

[Witt] What does this mean for Lithuania?

[Landsbergis] This gives Lithuania the hope that our problems can be solved by negotiations. Russia's new democratic leaders lay claim to the right to make agreements with other Soviet Republics, such as the Baltic Republics, without the Kremlin.

[Witt] Did you expect a change of power in Russia when you declared your independence?

[Landsbergis] At that time we also saw efforts for more autonomy in other republics, but we did not expect this to happen so quickly.

[Witt] What is the cooperation between the Balts good for?

[Landsbergis] We can see this in the field of the economy where it works already.

Landsbergis Addresses 15 June Supreme Council*LD1506192690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0911 GMT 15 Jun 90*

[Report by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis delivered at the 15 June Supreme Council session in Vilnius—from the live relay]

[Excerpts] Members of the government of the republic of Lithuania, chairmen of the local government councils, mayors and heads, esteemed foreign guests:

Today's session of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania is not ordinary in any sense. Our session concerns the marking of a painful date, of the memory of tragic events and the examination of the whole period in the life of the nation. It is devoted to the events half a century old, as a result of which Lithuania was forcibly incorporated into the USSR.

On 15 June 1940, the Soviet Union, violating the existing interstate agreements between Lithuania and the USSR and the norms of the international law, invaded the territory of the Lithuanian state. [passage omitted]

Lithuania must remain noble, not abuse some Soviet soldiers who 50 years ago or this year came to Lithuania, and not on his free will. Now even the paratroopers, having conversed with people on the street, begin to understand that matters differ in Lithuania from those described in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA or by the ZA RODINU political instructors. On the other hand, when volunteers are being beaten up with rubber truncheons; when the people's deputy is harmed; when the premises of editorial offices, the procuracy, or the archives are occupied; we demand that justice be done and look in the direction of the rising sun. Where is that legitimate state promised by our neighbors? Justice reminds us that there is no statute of limitations for the crimes and criminals of Rainiai, Paneriai, and Klebociai. All this epoch of crimes in Lithuania started in 1940, when our state was destroyed. [passage omitted]

There are many similar actions and parallels in Soviet policy in the Baltic area in 1940, and regrettably, in 1990. The press campaigns against Lithuania, then and now, are similar, especially when invented things and unfounded accusations take place. [passage omitted]

According to Helmut Kohl, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, who—at the solemn Bundestag session condemned this diabolic pact—Germany feels responsibility toward all countries that have suffered because of it. Is the same responsibility felt by another culprit, Germany's partner at that time? [passage omitted]

Yes, the way of our Eastern neighbor to repentance is difficult. Our way toward independence also has not been easy. [passage omitted]

The post-war decade meant the great exile of up-to-now not completely understood historical phenomenon of a

nation that has lost its state. Great sacrifices resembling genocide, sufferings of the pointless toil and hunger by the slaves, thousands and thousands of known and many more unknown graves. Then the return of those who survived, but were they expected? What does the ice of Trofimovka mean in Lithuania in the eyes and heart of a new superior? It is astonishing, but the wrong is so immense that there is no place for revenge, but only a great feeling of truth and the desire for justice. [passage omitted]

There was no developed underground dissident movement or underground press. A more consistent and greater resistance has been carried out by the editors of the CHRONICLE of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, but we may say that the whole of not-Bolshevized Lithuania was underground [passage omitted]

A special part in the struggle against coercion and oppression has been played by the Lithuanian Catholic Church. Perhaps never before in the last 600 years has it been so close to the people. The clergymen and believers had to make great sacrifices in those decades to preserve the nation, its spirit, and its love for the homeland. Together with the nation, they had to experience its fate in the exile in Siberia, where nearly one quarter of a million of Lithuania's residents were deported. The truth of belief also comforted those who have experienced the system destroying man and his toil here in Lithuania.

We have seen Lithuania's nature, culture, morals, historical memory, and language being destroyed. We realized that we were in the greatest danger, but at the same time that times were changing and that we could change them ourselves by defending the nation's life. [passage omitted]

We are at home, in our state. We do not have everything essential to manage our affairs independently; we do not have all the levers of power and the protection of the citizens because they are in the hands of the stronger, but might is not right, and it does not create right. No new right can be created by the violation of rights 50 years ago. Therefore what we have in Lithuania, these are features of our state. And what they do not hand over to us also is ours. This has been particularly stressed by the restoration of independence, the act proclaiming the state's continuity, and the establishment of the ties of the Lithuanian Constitution. This did not leave any illusions that a Constitution imposed by some other state could be valid in Lithuania. We did all this on 11 March. [passage omitted]

"Today we could ask the rather large and indifferent world why its interests are more weighty than its principles, and what this would mean to the further progress of Christian civilization. We could ask very simply: 50 years, why? And how many more? And why, when the faces of the states are changing, cruelty is not harmful, but goodness could be harmful? [passage omitted] The word homeland has a not-forgotten meaning for us. It is known in our hearts. When we are basing themselves on

it, not loudly declaring, but restoring our destroyed state, these questions already are written in the European sky. Maybe the fact that we have written one or another forgotten [words indistinct] will be our contribution to the common home. Our efforts are aimed at this home not having a single room with iron bars.

Prunskiene Addresses 15 June Supreme Council

LD1606095590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0952 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Speech by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene to the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 15 June—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The nation suffered a great loss 50 years ago when it lost its statehood. [passage omitted] Lithuania, becoming a state once again, is painfully feeling how difficult it is to join the family of the world states which, although they have not recognized Lithuania's annexation by the Soviet Union, have reconciled with factual reality, with our factual existence and our dependence upon the Soviet Union. Perhaps because of this they are not in a hurry to recognize us. [passage omitted] These states openly list two reasons why they do not recognize Lithuania. [passage omitted]

The first reason is that Lithuania does not manage its affairs on Lithuania's territory. Of course, today we understand that this is partially true. This is a sphere not controlled by Lithuania; it is the result of our long incorporation into the Soviet Union and occupation. This applies, first of all, to the protection of Lithuania's borders. As far as internal life is concerned, I think that we have the right to say Lithuania manages its affairs much better than, on the whole, the Soviet Union. And if this is so, one should not doubt if it is possible to recognize Lithuania. One should doubt whether today the Soviet Union is a state exerting control over the situation. [applause] I think that each day this control is becoming weaker and, most certainly, the Soviet Union's leadership is beginning to understand that without basic transformations it will cease to be a state. But, this is their own problem.

The second reason, at least temporarily, is the vagueness; who we are and what kind of a state we are creating. To say the republic of Lithuania is independent is not enough. What kind of independent republic? I think this problem is being examined. It exists in many states which endeavor to cooperate with us. We must pass this test; we are passing it. Maybe, I am not modest if I say that I myself have taken this test more than once in my meetings with the leading persons in the great states. But, this test has not finished; it is going on. We all must pass this test. [passage omitted]

The third reason is whether Lithuania and Gorbachev as the Soviet Union's president; whether Lithuania and democratic processes in the Soviet Union and East Europe and in Europe as a whole are not an alternative,

that is, if other states will recognize Lithuania, its independence; whether this will not prevent the consolidation of the unification of Germany, the process of disarmament and new relations between East and West, if Lithuania's independence suddenly would disturb the balance of power, would destabilize the Soviet Union itself. I think today there are ever fewer people who believe that this reason is valid. [passage omitted]

We must obtain recognition not only from the Russian Federation. We must obtain recognition from the Soviet Union, or from that union or community which will exist after we, having traversed the period of transition, will consolidate our achievements. The Western states support such a development, that the recognition should start from that side which caused the loss of our independence and that negotiations should start.

I do not think they will wait for the conclusion of negotiations. I think the beginning of negotiations will be a great step and argument to start recognition of the Lithuanian state in the world. [passage omitted]

The condition is clear. Negotiations will start if Lithuania, its Supreme Council, makes certain concessions, a certain retreat. Today, I do not wish to dwell on this problem in detail. It requires a very serious preparation, concentration, and I think this will take place soon. But, there cannot be concessions and retreat by one side only. And during our conversation the position of the other side was stated clearly. That is, after a decision adopted by the Supreme Council, which we do not discuss here, the other side will take its own steps by lifting what we call an economic blockade and what they call economic sanctions.

During our last meeting Premier Ryzhkov and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Lukyanov, mentioned more than once that both sides should trust each other more, that trust is a condition to start negotiations. We may have our own opinion what kind of trust the other side deserves, especially after the description of our actions during President Gorbachev's meetings in North America. But, today his attitude is different, obviously different. I have no doubts about it. We must not examine this problem bearing in mind what was taking place two weeks ago. We must examine this problem in the present situation, basing ourselves on what is happening now, and not on what was happening a few days ago. And the situation is changing; it is changing to a great extent for our benefit, too. There are many processes both in the East and in the West which help the other side to strive for negotiations, too.

We know now, and this was stated in our meeting, what conditions will be put by the other side in negotiations. It will be proposed to us to choose between two ways. The first way will be to remain in the Union in accordance with a new Union agreement, and its project is being drawn up and we are invited to take part in its preparation. Another question is whether it is useful for us to refuse to take part in the preparation of the document

without any obligations, whether it is useful to contribute to the improvement of this document when we know that in any case it concerns our future [words indistinct] I was of the same opinion one and one-half years ago when we started discussing the law on our economic independence and the so-called Maslyukov project. This discussion helped the other side to come closer to the thought that today economic independence does not shock anyone, and independence is understood not only by many members of parliament, but also by many Soviet people. [passage omitted] It was said to us that the status of Lithuania could be special. It seems that we ourselves could propose and support the project of such status. [passage omitted]

I have drawn the attention of my interlocutors that both during the negotiations and during the transition period there should be no oppression from the other side which would lead to the forced choice of the first way. Lithuania must have free choice so that we can see this first way as one of the possibilities. Several possibilities are always better than one only. [passage omitted]

The second way which was mentioned is not belonging to the Union. The matter would concern the existence of Lithuania as an independent state [word indistinct] the intention by the Soviet Union to apply to us the analogue of the Soviet Union's relations with Finland, Sweden, or Norway.

The question is whether these versions are acceptable to us. Maybe there is a third version, not connected with the analogue of relations with these three states. But, the other side told us that if we reject the first and choose the second or even the third versions, there will be corresponding conditions.

They are: territory. They have in mind Klaipeda, the rayons of Vilnius, as if they would be the object of discussion whether they belong to Lithuania or not as territorial units. This is the problem for which we must be seriously prepared as negotiations are coming closer.

The Soviet Union's leadership stressed that in this case we would lose the privileges of the Soviet Union's market. And the market must become a basis for a new Union, the agreement of which was mentioned and the project of which has already been prepared in the first version. [passage omitted]

Thus, after having made a decision on these versions we will have to work very hard so that special conditions in a bad sense, if we reject the first version, will be less painful. And we know from our recent experience what it means.

As I stated, an independent Lithuanian state is only the beginning of statehood. We must form the traditions of statehood, state wisdom, state behavior for all of us, for both the parliament and the government, behaviour in contacts with each other. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis Views Declaration of Independence

*LD1606162590 Prague CTK in English 1525 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[Text] Jurmala June 16 (CTK correspondent)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis denied here today the rumours that the Lithuanian parliament is to consider still this week a reply to the demand of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to revoke the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

In an interview to CTK, Vytautas Landsbergis, who attended the second assembly of representatives of People's Movements for Independence from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, however, admitted that this step, with which Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev conditions the opening of a dialogue on Lithuania's independence, equally as in the case of Latvia and Estonia, is now being considered in the parliament's lobbies, and that he himself considers its possible consequences. He said that the Lithuanian parliament will assume its stand on Gorbachev's demand "in the coming weeks."

According to the highest Lithuanian representative, Lithuania is interested in finding a compromise and is striving for it. It is, however, necessary to distinguish between a compromise and a capitulation, especially in relation to the declaration of independence. Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out that Gorbachev's demand, or rather ideas of the Soviet leadership about the form of its realization are rather unclear and will have to be clarified, but he refused to say whether a new meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev might be expected in the nearest future.

In connection with extending the limited supplies of Soviet natural gas to Lithuania, which was announced in Moscow on Friday, Vytautas Landsbergis said that this is undoubtedly an expression of the goodwill. He said that he does not know any details of this decision but admitted that Vilnius might also react to it with a gesture of goodwill.

Landsbergis Asks Leningrad To Host Conference

*LD1806195390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1000 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Text] A second human rights conference will take place in Leningrad at the beginning of September. The conference is organized by the Polish trade union Solidarity and the Movement for Peace and Independence.

The first conference took place in 1988 in Krakow. It was planned to hold the second conference in Vilnius, however, as a result of a conflict between the Government of the USSR and Lithuania visits by foreigners have been banned.

On 16 June Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania; asked Sobachak, chairman of the Leningrad City Council, and Rybakov, chairman of the Commission, to hold this

conference in Leningrad. Consent for this was given by the Leningrad City Council Presidium. The conference will be labelled: "Leningrad-Vilnius 90."

Bakucionis Reports Dismissal From Procuracy

*LD1706190890 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 17 Jun 90*

[Text] The Lithuanian republic's senior deputy procurator, Jurgis Bakucionis, has informed the press that he recently received notification of his dismissal from the procuracy organs of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Demands are being made on him to surrender secret documents and collection of USSR Procurator General Orders and Instructions. He also is warned that criminal proceedings may be instituted against him in the event of their loss or his refusal to surrender them.

This document was signed by Antanas Kasauskas, who was sent here from Moscow to carry out the duties of Lithuanian SSR procurator.

I am still working at the Lithuanian Republic Procuracy, says Jurgis Bakucionis. Petrauskas and several of his accomplices, supported by soldiers who are armed to the teeth, imagines the continuing existence of an SSR procuracy. Is it possible that Petrauskas is serious in his determination to protect that which is destined to perish? The fact that, being insensitive to the spirit of the times he has involved himself in such dishonorable work, is to be pitied for this jurist's knowledge and experience could have been useful to our native land, Lithuania, too. Soldiers' bayonets will not protect him from the Lithuanian people's disdain.

Prunskiene, Ozolas Depart for Greece via Moscow

*LD1706203290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1900 GMT 17 Jun 90*

[Summary] The Lithuanian Information Agency announces that Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania, and Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas have left for Moscow. From there they will travel to Greece, where they will meet the Greek prime minister, leaders of various parties, businessmen, and journalists.

The visit was organized by the (KAI) radio station and the (?KATHIMERINI) newspaper. Several high-ranking Soviet officials, including Boris Yeltsin, have visited Greece on the invitation of this paper.

Supreme Soviet Adopts 'Occupation' Statement

*LD1806192190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a report from Estonia, which we'll try to make out.

The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic has adopted the statement of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian republic in connection with the 50th anniversary of the occupation of the Estonian republic by the USSR. The start of the occupation, as it follows from this document, was laid on 17 June 1940 when, according to a treaty, a contingent of Soviet armed forces was brought into the territory of Estonia. In connection with this, the statement says that day became, in the recent history of Estonia, a fateful turning point when Estonia was cut off from Europe and its people were forced to live contrary to their traditions and wishes.

Deputy Zakharov submitted an alternative draft statement which asserts the socialist revolution in Estonia in 1940 was not a consequence of occupation, but was the result of the struggle of the working class, of all working people. The version he proposed on behalf of a group of Russian-speaking deputies was rejected by the decision of Lauristin—chairing that session and one of the initiators of the adoption of the statement—which asserts Zakharov's draft contradicts the 30 March decision of the Supreme Soviet on the state status of Estonia, which virtually revoked Soviet laws in the territory of the republic, which declared a transitional period.

As is known then, a significant group of deputies, representing Russian-speaking regions of the republic, refused to vote. The decision, called unconstitutional by a decree of the president of the USSR, but which still has not been revoked, was adopted on 30 March by the mechanical majority of the representatives of the indigenous population. Today the picture was repeated during voting. Out of 76 present at the session of deputies, 60 voted for the statement, five against, five abstained, and six did not take part in the voting. These last 16 people have signed the alternative draft, which they have decided to have published in the press.

Report on 14-15 May Latvian Supreme Soviet

*90UN2018D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA
in Russian 16 May 90 p 3*

[“Information Report: First Session of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet of the 12th Convocation”]

[Text] The announcement of Deputy T. Yundzis on a bill on the attitude toward military service and a draft declaration of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet on the attitude toward USSR forces in Latvia was discussed on 14 May at the evening sitting. The proposals received on this issue were handed over for examination to a commission of the Supreme Soviet.

At the request of A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Deputy A. Alekseyev familiarized himself with a leaflet which had been distributed in Riga calling for an end to the counterrevolution and calling deputies of the Supreme Soviet a bunch of adventurers, and did not deny that it belonged to the Interfront. The Supreme Soviet set up a commission to look into this incident.

A Supreme Soviet commission had by this time prepared its findings pertaining to the proposals concerning a change in Articles 97 and 100 of the Constitution. An announcement on this issue was made by Deputy A. Endzin, chairman of the commission.

Following the insertion of more precise wording, the Supreme Soviet adopted amendments to the Constitution, removing the basic problems of a quorum at Supreme Soviet sessions.

The Supreme Soviet then continued discussion of nominations for the government. I. Godmanis, chairman of republic Council of Ministers, proposed for the office of republic Finance Minister E. Silinsh. The candidate answered deputies' questions.

Following discussion of his candidacy, E. Silinsh was appointed minister of finance of the Republic of Latvia.

Deputy M. Budovskiy announced the results of the work of the commission looking into the incident involving the leaflet signed by the Interfront. The republic procuracy and the Committee for State Security were instructed to investigate this matter, adopt the appropriate measures, and notify the Supreme Soviet of this.

A decision was made also on inviting television to the Supreme Soviet building on 15 May for the purpose of averting incidents like that caused the day before by the military.

On the issue of the military service obligation of inhabitants of Latvia information on the results of the commission's work was presented by Deputy T. Yundzis.

The Supreme Soviet enacted a law on a change in Article 61 of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution regulating alternative service. In accordance with the new law, the sole criterion at the time of a decision on the question of military service is the desire or unwillingness to perform it.

This concluded the 14 May evening sitting.

On 15 May the deputies continued examination of the previous day's agenda. Deputy T. Yundzis acquainted them with a draft law on alterations and additions to certain legislative enactments of the republic and a draft decree on the military service obligation of inhabitants of Latvia. On behalf of the commission he withdrew from discussion a draft declaration on the attitude toward USSR forces in Latvia. The drafts were discussed.

Before the break A. Gorbunov informed the deputies of a communication received from the republic prosecutor in connection with the investigation of the incident involving the Interfront leaflet. The communication said that an investigation had begun in the procedure determined by law for a decision on the question of whether to institute criminal proceedings. The results of the investigation will be reported to the Supreme Soviet. The prosecutor pointed out that it was clear from the text of

the leaflet that its authors were calling for a violation of the established procedure of the holding of meetings and demonstrations. If such meetings and demonstrations take place, measures will be implemented to institute against their organizers proceedings stipulated by law.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet proposed that Deputy A. Alekseyev, leader of the Interfront, adopt measures to avert incidents on the part of people who have answered the Interfront call. The deputy objected that the people who had arrived were in agreement with the edict of the USSR president and were defending their state.

The first break in the proceedings lasted 90 minutes since time was needed to defuse the situation around the Supreme Soviet building created by a confrontation between supporters and opponents of Latvia's independence, investigate the appeals, resolutions, and ultimatums which had been addressed to the Supreme Soviet, and hold talks with representatives of forces which were causing the conflicts.

The session resumed at 1330 hours. A. Gorbunov announced that he had negotiated with representatives of the Riga Military Garrison, members of servicemen's families, and activists of the United Council of Labor Collectives and the strike committee. Personally and on behalf of I. Godmanis he proposed that the deputies create a joint commission with the said representatives and examine viewpoints connected with the declaration on the restoration of the independence of the republic of Latvia and the USSR president's edict. It was proposed also that new laws not be enacted while it was at work, that the government continue to be formed, and that representatives of the strike committee invited to the hall be afforded an opportunity to read out their appeal.

A number of deputies objected to this, expressing the opinion that the declaration was not subject to reevaluation and that parliament, which had been elected by the people, should continue to work in accordance with the agenda and not yield to pressure. And that problems which arise should be resolved in accordance with the generally accepted provisions. Commissions may be formed, but only from members of parliament and experts, and only members of parliament have the right to speak from this platform and read out documents.

At the same time, however, other deputies called for an appreciation of the actual danger, for the electorate to be met, and for the necessary talks to be held. For the people this is now more important than the enactment of this law or the other. In addition, account should be taken of the possibility of more powerful demonstrations of the contending forces. For this reason it would be more expedient to counterpose to force political methods of work. There were calls also for a suspension of the declaration on restoration of the independence of the republic of Latvia and fulfillment of the USSR president's edict.

Meetings of the factions were held prior to the vote on this issue.

As a result of the vote the proposals of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet were adopted in the following amended form: 1) To create a commission of deputies headed by D. Ivans, first deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet; 2) To continue the work of the Supreme Soviet in accordance with the approved agenda; 3) To duplicate the appeal of the strike committee and distribute it among the deputies.

After this, deputies of the "Equality" faction walked out, leaving behind a statement noting that the faction supports the USSR president's edict of 14 May 1990 on the illegal adoption by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on 4 May 1990 of the declaration "On Restoration of the Independence of the republic of Latvia." The faction addresses to all people's deputies of the Latvian SSR the insistent demand that they cease to enact laws and decrees contrary to the USSR Constitution and the Latvian SSR Constitution. We call on the state, law enforcement, and economic authorities to be guided in their activity only by the Latvian SSR Constitution and legislative enactments which are not in contradiction to it.

The session resumed. A law on alterations and additions to certain legislative enactments of the Latvian SSR and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet decree on the military service obligation of inhabitants of Latvia were adopted by majority vote.

Latvian Parliament Sets Out Agenda

*LD1806201190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1102 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Text] The relay from the Latvian parliament session has just ended. It began this morning with a minute's silence in memory of the occupation of the republic of Latvia, carried out 50 years ago, in memory of the victims of the genocide directed against the Latvian people, and in memory of the deputies of the Latvian parliament and members of the government. A short speech describing the 17 June 1940 invasion by the Soviet Union and its consequences for Latvia was given by Deputy (Ivars Silars).

Afterward, the parliament began to confirm the agenda for the week. It was resolved that this week the plenary session will take place, as usual, on three days: Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Today, as you understand already, the session worked for only half the day because, as always, the work will continue in the various factions during the afternoon. Thus, as (Aivars Tiltins) already informed you just now, the session will begin its work tomorrow and the day after one hour earlier, at 0900 [0600 GMT], so there will be an opportunity for more questions to be examined.

So, on the forthcoming days there also will be on the agenda the draft laws on the rights of the budget of the

republic of Latvia; on changes to the 1990 state budget of the republic of Latvia, and a draft resolution of creating a supplementary budget fund for social assistance; followed by the material provisions for deputies, for (?their) secretary, and the material provisions for this secretary; a draft law on the Environment Protection Committee of the republic of Latvia; confirmation of the composition of this committee; and a draft law on publishing a newspaper of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers.

Also on the agenda is the question of the activity of political parties and other public political organizations in the republic's organs of state administration and in the law-enforcement establishments; a draft law on changes and additions to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic labor law code; a draft law on the formation of a working group to formulate the Constitution; and a draft resolution on the formation of a working group for drawing up a law on citizenship.

Latvia Front Chairman Gives Interview

*LD1506152790 Warsaw PAP in English 1312 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow, June 15—Chairman of the People's Front of Latvia Dainis Ivans recently granted an interview to PAP's Zdzislaw Raczynski. Excerpts:

The People's Front unites various political forces and parties which proceed from the grounds of democracy, which are united by the goal of rebuilding an independent, free, democratic republic of Latvia. I think that such a movement as the People's Front is still necessary, at least up to the time future, free and universal elections to parliament are held in Latvia. These elections will mean a conclusion of the transitional period and a restoration of de facto Latvian statehood.

At present however, when the new parliament has been elected, in which our representatives hold a majority, the front loses its significance as a pre-parliament. We should therefore go further. We should currently go through a multi-party lesson in the front.

We do not advocate a secession from the Soviet Union because we never joined it. We should first regulate the legal aspects of our relations with the Soviet Union and it is the Soviet Union which should solve these problems on an equal rights and just basis. The restoration of the three Baltic states should become an object of international settlements because only these three states became the victims of World War II in the sense that they were erased from the political map of the world. We shall continue to consistently tread this path, seeking possibilities of dialogue and compromise, but I cherish no illusions as to some abstract model of a confederation or federation promised by Moscow or special status for the Baltic republic. No one really knows what this special status would mean.

We had the opportunity of discussing this subject in Moscow with Gorbachev and Ryzhkov and even they do not have any concrete concept of the future federation or confederation. How long can you fool a nation with beautiful but empty phrases? In order for a just and democratic society to surface in this part of the world called the Soviet Union nowadays, each nation and each republic should be left the decision as to which road it takes, the right to equal-rights relations with other nations and republics.

What the Soviet Union proposes is a dialogue based on unequal rights and ridiculing the will and aspirations of nations. A law on non-secession from the Soviet Union is adopted with a majority of votes somewhere in Moscow and it is suggested we obey it. This mutilates our nation and ignores its clearly expressed will and commonly recognized norms and rules of law and morality, said he.

So, when asked about the secession from the Soviet Union and Latvia's future shape I am giving a concrete answer—I am an advocate of full, real and unconditional independence of the Latvian state. I do not understand how an independent state can operate within another one.

We do not want to break ties and economic links that have already been established. It would be profitable neither for us nor for the entire Soviet Union.

I think Moscow should be interested in dialogue which would make it possible to restore the statehood of the three Baltic republics in a smooth and effective way since independent and rich Baltic states better suit objective interests of the Soviet Union than humiliated, aggressive and subjugated republics.

Nationalist Paramilitary Force Revived in Latvia

*PM1806140590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[Report for IZVESTIYA by TASS correspondent V. Zaytsev, under the "Direct Line" rubric: "What Will Be the Tasks of the Three Regiments of 'Defenders'?"]

[Text] Riga—In Latvia a paramilitary organization, the Aizsargs [home guard] (the word means "defenders" in Latvian) is being revived.

It was established in 1919 by K. Ulmanis, leader of the Peasant Union Party, and made up of people politically devoted to that party. The organization existed officially until summer 1940 and had more than 60,000 members. It is now being revived on the initiative of the Latvian Citizens' Committee, enlisting "citizens of the Latvian Republic" who are "nationalistically minded and devoted" to the state. The organization's declared aim is maintenance of peace, order, and public security. In the oath it is formulated slightly differently: "I swear to spare no effort or my life to restore the Latvian republic and to defend its independence."

It must be mentioned that during the years of the bourgeois republic in Latvia the Aizsargs carried out police functions and combated the Communist Party, which was underground, exposing its members and supporters. During the war Aizsargs formed the nucleus of the several dozen police battalions formed by the Hitlerites for operations on the Eastern Front.

It is planned at the moment to form three regiments of Aizsargs comprising up to 2,000 men.

And although the initiators of the revival of the Aizsargs organization believe that this will make it possible to improve order in the republic, these actions are causing concern among a considerable section of the population. Especially those who have already encountered the so-called "new order" in their lives.

Survey Shows Latvian Groups Differ on Secession

*LD1806165790 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT
18 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga June 18 TASS—A referendum on Latvia's secession from the Soviet Union is favoured by 24.8 per cent of Letts and 86.2 per cent of Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Jews, and Poles living in the Latvian capital.

This was one of the questions in a poll carried out among 1,070 Riga residents by the cost-accounting social information agency Socionix.

According to the results of the opinion survey, published today, Riga residents are not as categorical about rejecting a referendum as Latvian lawmakers.

Last December, the agency studied the Riga non-native population's attitude to Latvia's secession from the USSR. Sixty-eight per cent of Russian speakers opposed that step.

This time the question was repeated in a slightly different form: "How do you assess the declaration on the restoration of state independence, adopted by the Supreme Soviet?"

The declaration that aims to separate the republic from the USSR was approved on May 4.

The number of Russian speakers opposed to the idea rose to 76.4 per cent. 88.5 per cent of the Letts living in Riga approved of the parliament's decision.

Opinions of the two groups—Letts and non-Letts—never coincided. 72.7 per cent of non-Letts believe that an authoritarian state is likely to emerge should Latvia withdraw from the Union, while only 14 per cent of Letts share this viewpoint.

The majority of native speakers are convinced that all ethnic groups will enjoy equality in an independent Latvia. A mere 7 per cent of non-Letts share their conviction.

The Latvian Popular Front reiterated that an independent state cannot be built by relying on one—Lettish—part of the population.

The front called upon its activists to explain the organization's goals and calm down passions among non-Letts. According to the poll, however, the number of people who are worried by developments has increased. In December, 16 per cent of respondents from among the non-Lettish speaking population intended to leave Latvia once it secedes from the USSR. The figure stands at 31.5 per cent now.

The Popular Front believes that "society is being disoriented" by the Communist Party, Interfront and other "destructive forces".

Many believe, however, that people themselves draw conclusions from parliament's work: the ethnically uniform government, formed by the parliament, the selection of personnel from among Popular Front followers, disrespect for the opinion of the parliamentary opposition and other factors.

Riga Radio Reports Airline Hijacking

*LD1906100790 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
0900 GMT 19 Jun 90*

[Text] And now Aivars Tiltins to speak.

[Tiltins] Yes, and now a rather unpleasant piece of news, which has been received literally just now, when this broadcast had, in fact, already started. It is also connected with aviation [the previous item in the newscast dealt with the An-2 hijacked to Turkey].

It is reported to us from the Latvian Republican Civil Aviation Production Association that aboard an aircraft flying from Riga to Murmansk today, while in the Leningrad area, some as yet unidentified persons threatened to carry out acts of terrorism and ordered the pilot of this airliner to change course and fly in a westerly direction. The aircraft has landed at Helsinki. As Anatoliy Belaychuk, head of the Civil Aviation Association reported, an investigation is being conducted at present, and we shall keep you informed about that in subsequent broadcasts.

Latvia's Ivans Interviewed at Baltic Assembly

*LD1606215190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 16 Jun 90*

[Report by correspondent N. Kasyanova; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Baltic Assembly, whose history began exactly a year ago in Tallinn, has now gathered together in Jurmala the leaders of the Latvian and Estonian Popular

Fronts and the Lithuanian movement for perestroika, Sajudis. The basic aim of this forum could be defined in the words of one of the speakers: a departure along the road of independence, which will not mean independence of the three Baltic republics from each other.

The speeches of the participants in the assembly were devoted to questions of coordination of action, mutual assistance and support. Are the Popular Fronts necessary today when the movements have been victorious at the elections and have occupied key posts in the governments and the republics have, in essence, received complete power? Is there a fall in activity and a weariness among the people of political storms? The breakthrough by the popular movements into real power has been accomplished, but the new governments are faced by the difficult situation of adopting unpopular laws. How can support for the Balts by the Soviet Union's democratic movement be ensured? Such is the circle of problems broadly discussed by the assembly's participants. [video shows Landsbergis talking to Ivans, chairman of Latvian Popular Front, then scenes of assembly hall including both Ivans and Landsbergis speaking—no audio]

Just now talks are being held, and there is a possibility of having talks with the president. What is your attitude, your view on this situation?

[Ivans] Well, I consider that this step in our direction by the president. We consider that this is a very positive step, and we have now begun in our parliament to discuss the president's proposal. Of course the second stage will be discussion together with the leaders of Lithuania and Estonia in order that our problem, the problem in future, be examined jointly, so that it is not only the problem of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, but the relation of the Baltic states. It is also difficult for me to say in what way we should act in this situation.

But I think that the president's proposal gives the possibility of widening the poles for political maneuvering. It gives the possibility of various ways for solving our problem. So it is nevertheless a step forward. And we cannot leave it without an answer. We must answer, since this proposal is very important, I consider; so we must think our answer over very carefully. [video shows Ivans being interviewed]

[Kasyanova] The participants in the assembly in Jurmala have adopted a declaration on cooperation and peace between the Baltic peoples and a series of other documents. It is planned to hold a third Baltic assembly in a year in Lithuania. [video shows further scenes from the assembly]

Baltic Assembly Envisages Unity of Policies

*LD1806174490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Excerpts] We are in the same boat, and should be rowing in the same direction: This is a figurative description of the current situation at the second Baltic

Assembly, and it undoubtedly became the main theme of this event taking place on the seaside resort of Jurmala on 16 June.

About 200 representatives from the People's Front of Latvia and Estonia and the Lithuanian Sajudis movement gathered there in order to discuss their political role and place under the new conditions. [passage omitted]

Our movement must remain the link between the wide masses of the population and the authorities, so that the authorities do not divorce themselves from the people: this is how Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania formulated the main objective for Sajudis and the people's fronts in his speech at the Baltic Assembly.

Three issues were discussed at the assembly: One, the place of people's movements and of social and political processes in the republics; two, the Baltic process and democratic movements in the Soviet Union; three; the struggle of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia for their state independence within the context of European security.

A number of resolutions were adopted by the participants. Among them were the following: Concerning people's diplomacy; concerning the embargo of Lithuania; appeal to the Supreme Soviet of Russia concerning the resolution of interstate relations with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; concerning the principles of the peace treaties of 1920; and documents expressing the wish of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to return to the family of European states.

So that joint actions can be coordinated, problems of a similar nature should be ascertained. This work has already begun. [Words indistinct] debates, for example, on the topic of coordination of actions in order to win the non-indigenous population of the republics over to our side. The place of the movements with relation to other movements and factions, for example with the citizens' committees and the communists, should be determined. It is also necessary, of course, that the main task be remembered instantly—the preservation of the declared independence, and the guarantee of democracy.

Representatives of the people's fronts of Russia, Belorussia, Armenia, and Georgia were guests at the Baltic Assembly. They all demonstrated their readiness to support the aspiration of the three republics to achieve their full independence.

Information about specific steps taken in order to break through the embargo on Lithuania was given in the reports made at the assembly. A congratulatory telegram from the Russian Democratic Party was received. [passage omitted]

RSFSR

Reportage on 19 June Russian Party Conference

Conference Opens

LD1906061390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0555 GMT on 19 June begins carrying a live relay of the "opening of the Russian Party conference" from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 0558 GMT Gorbachev is shown arriving on the platform to applause.

Voting Commission Proposed

LD1906061790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Gorbachev says let's get down to business straight away. A total of 2,768 delegates were elected, of whom 2,744 have arrived for the conference, Gorbachev says.

A total of 200 workers and peasants have been invited, and there are representatives of the republican parties. A presidium, secretariat, and drafting and credentials commissions have to be elected. Gorbachev suggests a commission to supervise the electronic voting system, and reads out proposed names.

Presidium Membership Noted

LD1906062390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0606 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

The conference endorses the commission to supervise the voting system: 2,637 vote for, 17 against, and 20 abstain.

At 0607 GMT Gorbachev asks for a vote on the presidium membership, details of which have been distributed to delegates. The names are not read out. This is passed with 2,598 for, 51 against, and 19 abstentions.

At 0610 GMT Gorbachev invites members of the presidium to come up. They include Ryzhkov, Yeltsin, and Lukyanov.

Agenda Proposed

LD1906065490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0612 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

There is a problem with the electronic vote and voting on the secretariat has to be done by a show of hands, necessitating a count of the "against" votes, which amount to 37.

At 0619 GMT a shot of the platform permits the following identifications, left to right of screen: Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, Gorbachev, unidentified person, Lukyanov, Silayev. There is no clear shot yet of others on either side.

At 0620 GMT Gorbachev then asks for a vote on the drafting commission, and following several interventions from the floor, the vote—on the electronic system which is now functioning—is taken. Again, viewers are not told who is proposed for the commission. Vote: 2,598 for, 51 against, 19 abstentions.

At 0624 GMT Gorbachev proposes a vote on the membership of the credentials commission: 2,645 for, 26 against, 28 abstentions. Gorbachev asks the secretariat to commence work straight away. Video shows Ryzhkov and Yeltsin chatting. Gorbachev says that the agenda will comprise two points: the creation of a Russian Communist Party, and the draft platform and draft rules for the CPSU Party Congress.

At 0628 GMT a Kemerovo delegate reads a statement calling for a constituent congress to set up an Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Communist Party based on the CPSU program. Gorbachev calls for the text of the statement to be handed in.

At 0631 GMT a Perm delegate wants a slight amendment to the wording of the second point on the agenda: discussion of draft platforms for the 28th CPSU Congress.

At 0632 GMT another delegate says the second point is an attempt to divert the conference from a discussion of the current situation and the creation of a RSFSR party and should be removed.

At 0635 GMT a delegate asks that reports be delivered by representatives from all platforms.

Procedural Matters Discussed

LD1906073190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0637 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Delegates make more proposals: the party press should be discussed, the conference must be turned into a constituent congress.

At 0641 GMT a delegate proposes that resolutions be adopted expressing the views of the conference of the RSFSR declaration of sovereignty and a recent Komsomol (All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League) decision.

At 0642 GMT a delegate says the representatives of the working class invited to the conference should be allowed to play an active part in the conference.

At 0644 GMT Gorbachev asks whether the conference wants to carry on listening to further proposals: only a minority want to carry on. Gorbachev says the key point is whether there should be an RSFSR Communist Party or not, and what the arguments are, and there must be a logic in the conference agenda. There must be a report on the present situation and the need for the Russian Communist Party, and all this is taking place in the context of the run-up of the CPSU Congress, so there is a logical link between the Russian Communist Party and the forthcoming congress debate. If the conference agrees to set up Russian Communist Party, it should then transform itself into a constituent congress. The idea is to have a second stage at which a Russian Communist Party would go into matters in greater detail. There should be two days of discussion of the present situation and the establishment of the party out of the four days proposed for this first stage. If a congress is constituted, there will have to be appeals and statements to the working people of Russia.

At 0656 GMT delegates make objections about time-limits on speeches, and ask about the role of the workers' representatives. Another says that effectively delegates have already voted for the creation of the Russian Communist Party by virtue of nominating their candidates for the new parties' ruling bodies.

At 0658 GMT Gorbachev denies that there is any contradiction here. He calls for a vote on whether to include point one—the establishment of the party—on the agenda. Carried: 2,607 for, 61 against, 16 abstentions. He calls for a vote on point two—whether to discuss the draft platform for the CPSU congress. Carried: 1,521 for, 1,054 against, 83 abstentions.

At 0704 GMT Gorbachev proposes that alternative reports be given 15 minutes each, alongside the reports in favor of the Democratic and Marxist platforms. Passed: 2,079 for, 557 against, 45 abstentions.

At 0708 GMT Gorbachev says he feels the party press can be discussed later, along with other ancillary issues. A vote is taken: 703 for discussing it now, 1,902 against, and 62 abstentions. The issue will be discussed later. What about the budget—should that be discussed now? Vote: 304 for, 2,318 against, 37 abstentions.

At 0715 GMT Gorbachev goes back to the issue of whether delegate status should be given to workers' representatives. A delegate says let's first define how long speeches should be and what issues will need a two-third majority. Delegates speak for and against giving workers representative delegate status. Another delegate says it's premature, since the powers of all delegates have yet to be defined by the credentials commission.

At 0722 GMT a Chelyabinsk delegate says we have the report of the preparatory committee.

Media Coverage Viewed

LD1906080690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0723 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Gorbachev draws attention to the proposals for standing orders. A delegate suggests that the conference should work in sections. Another delegate suggests full television coverage of proceedings, to be broadcast in the evenings. More proposed amendments to the standing orders are made.

At 0734 GMT in answer to proposals that votes on important matters should require a two-thirds or three-quarters majority, Gorbachev says that three-quarters is not customary, but the conference must decide. Gorbachev asks for a vote on whether the decision to set up a constituent congress will require a two-thirds or three-quarters majority. The vote on the two-thirds proposal is: 2,245 for, 410 against, 15 abstentions.

At 0739 GMT Gorbachev asks for a vote on whether there should be full television coverage on central television to be broadcast in nonworking hours. Passed: 1,353 for, 1,189 against, 94 abstentions. A vote is taken on time-limits on speeches. Gorbachev asks for a vote on whether to work in sections tomorrow, following today's plenary session. The proposal is voted down.

Standing Orders Vote Noted

LD1906081590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0748 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Referring to the standing orders that delegates have in front of them, Gorbachev puts amendments to point four saying that presidium members should chair proceedings in turn and should limit interventions to five minutes. This motion is carried. More discussion of procedure and standing orders ensues.

At 0758 GMT Delegate Kachanov from Kuybyshev Oblast says there should be a meeting with RSFSR deputies on day three of the proceedings.

At 0759 GMT a vote on standing orders as a whole, including the freshly-made amendments is held. Carried by 2,582 for, 81 against, and 23 abstentions. A deputy says that there has not yet been a vote on the necessary majority for important issues in addition to the constituent congress issue. Sobchak says a conference decision has no authority over state bodies: we should have asked for television coverage, not demanded it. Gorbachev agrees.

At 0804 GMT Gorbachev announces a 30-minute break. The discussion of the agenda will begin then.

A studio announcer says that coverage will resume after the break. Russian folk dancing is shown during the break.

Gorbachev Speaks

LD1906085790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0834 GMT on 19 June resumes its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Gorbachev is shown chatting to Yeltsin on the platform as delegates take their places. Ryzhkov assumes the chairmanship of the session and introduces Gorbachev for the report.

At 0836 GMT Gorbachev says that the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee for the conference decided to submit two points for the conference agenda, and to cover both in the same report. The times dictate a new role for the CPSU and the reform of it. The CPSU congress was brought forward for this reason. We need to consolidate patriotic and sober-minded forces within the context of our socialist choice.

At 0839 GMT Gorbachev says that in the context of a mounting debate on the role of republican communist parties, it has been deemed desirable and necessary to set up a Russian Communist Party, but there must be no clash between it and the CPSU. There is an understanding in the party and the country of the dramatic nature of the present situation, with concern over restructuring marking time in some area. A very profound turnaround has been achieved in the last five years. Some see it as a revolutionary event promising humanization and reform; others see the change as a collapse of everything, a veritable apocalypse. Attempts are being made to use difficulties as a battering-ram against restructuring as a whole, Gorbachev says.

The present reforms have far exceeded previous attempts at changes to the economic system. In two years, we have achieved, in the political context, more than was attained in whole decades. In international relations, the era of confrontation has been laid to rest, and the opportunity has arisen to switch resources away from military spending. We will not brook interference in our own affairs, but neither shall we encroach on others' sovereignty. Many will say the positive processes are painful and uneven, and destabilizing the situation. All this is true. But the important thing is to support the positive trends and to guard against extremes of either hue.

Gorbachev Urges Market Economy

LD1906094790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0851 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of

the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Gorbachev continues his speech. He says that in the ideological and political sphere, we have achieved what whole generations before us failed to attain. Video shows Ligachev in audience. We are undergoing the most crucial stage in the development of restructuring at the present moment. "We see the way out of the situation that has developed in a very rapid transition to a regulated market economy. We must, once and for all, overcome our hesitation in this respect; we must delve deeper into the essence of the problem and come to realize that we need the transition to a market not for its own sake, but so as to achieve new forms of economic life, to pursue new and effective forms of economic activity and labor." The only thing that is unacceptable is a return to the command-administrative system. The market is not the invention of capitalism: how can the market contradict socialism if it furthers the well-being of the working people? The market will encourage incentive, and it will go hand-in-glove with social protection measures.

Legislative measures are of great importance in avoiding the creation of a vacuum in the switch to a new system. Much work needs to be done by the party in changing people's consciousness. In 10 days time there will be a more detailed report at the CPSU congress. The party has taken responsibility for past failures and it cannot object to justified criticism. But attempts to impose on society a liquidationist attitude to the party are unacceptable. We underestimated the forces of separatism and nationalism, which create an explosive mixture when combined with adventurism. The clash of opinions is necessary and we encourage freedom of intellectual competition within the party, and the party's intellectual potential has only been enhanced in the pre-congress debate, Gorbachev says.

At 0907 GMT Gorbachev says the CPSU's pre-congress documents are based on the principles of humane socialism. The party will seek to achieve its goals exclusively through political means. The party is to transform itself into a purely political organization, abandoning its administrative functions, and will be in free competition with other political forces. The independence of the republican parties is also envisaged. Many thousands of letters have come into the CPSU in support of the creation of a Russian Communist Party. Immediate work must be done to set up a republican television, in addition to all the other measures to set up specifically Russian bodies. The setting up of a Russian Communist Party is part of this context. The Russian Communist Party will have to play a prominent role in law-making. Russia's social and economic development has in the past been in the control of central bodies, but it would be an exaggeration to claim that Russia was not considered at all as a state entity. The role of the Russian Communist Party should be as an integral part of the CPSU, and

at the same time one of the pillars of the Union. Trends toward regional separatism can be countered by speedier reform.

At 0923 GMT Gorbachev says that the role of the Russian Communist Party will be to create a new level of autonomy for the RSFSR. Russian communists can have a role to play in reviving the lost cultural heritage of Russia. How are we to combine isolationist tendencies in the RSFSR with retaining the Union in its historical role? Some people see the Russian Communist Party as a mere parliamentary party: This is part of a general attempt to destroy the CPSU from some quarters. Healthy motivation must be separated from destructive speculation. The decision on the setting up of a Russian Communist Party must be affirmative. It must be an organic part of the CPSU, and at the same time there must be freedom of action for the republican parties. The center should have the right to abrogate decisions of republican parties which run counter to the CPSU rules, and perhaps there should be rules against factions. The forthcoming congress must define the status of the CPSU Central Committee and republican Central Committees.

Gorbachev Endorses New Party

LD1906095390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0937 GMT on 19 June continues its live relay of the opening of the Russian party conference from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. Gorbachev continues his speech:

Gorbachev says that the new party should be called the Communist Party of the RSFSR—or CPRSFSR. He proposes that the conference should declare itself a constituent congress, set up the CPRSFSR and elect its bodies. The constituent congress should be held in two stages, the second to be deferred until after the 28th CPSU Congress.

Our goal is humane and democratic socialism within the context of a jointly worked out Union treaty. The congress must unequivocally condemn the Stalinism of the past and abandon the party's former monopoly on a basis of compromise.

At 0943 GMT Gorbachev ends his report. Ryzhkov says that three supplementary reports are to follow: for the preparatory committee, for the Democratic platform, and the Marxist platform.

At 0944 GMT the live relay ends.

Gorbachev Addresses Russian Party Conference

LD1906091190 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, is addressing the Communist Party Conference of Russia, the country's largest republic, which opened today.

Having stressed that the formation of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation is expedient and necessary, he warned against any counterposing of the Russian Federation to the USSR, and the Communist Party of the Russian Federation to that of the Soviet Union.

It is important for the party to make sober assessments and the practical steps in order to take society out of the crisis as early as possible.

Having condemned attempts to take advantage of the current situation to deliver a blow to perestroika and its supporters, the party leader pointed to the need for consolidation and national accord on a healthy basis.

Gorbachev gave a detailed analysis of current processes in the party and the country in the past five years and paid special attention to the role and place of communists in the life of society under multi-party conditions. He dwelt upon the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee and the Party Charter for the 28th Congress.

Committee Member Criticizes CPSU Leadership

*LD1906120690 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT
19 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The first speaker to take the floor after Mikhail Gorbachev delivered the report leveled sharp criticism at the CPSU Russian Communist Party.

Delivering a second report on behalf of the preparatory committee of the Russian Party Conference, committee member Ivan Osadchiy said "many communists" were convinced that the CPSU leadership was guilty that the party "was put in the position of one who had to catch up, consequently was losing initiative all the time, and cannot properly influence the development of events."

"Instead of strengthening all links of the party, determining its strategy and tactics, the CPSU leadership has reduced it to crouching unarmed in the trenches under massive shelling by anti-socialist forces, which have rapidly organized themselves," the speaker stressed. "The situation in the republic and, particularly, at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation would have been different if the Russian Communist Party had been set up before the beginning of the election campaign."

Osadchiy spoke out against turning the Russian Communist Party into "a social-democratic, reformist party of the parliamentary type." The majority of communists are convinced that "only a communist party of the Leninist type, based on Leninist foundations" can pull Russia out of its crisis, he said.

The position, set out by the representative of the preparatory committee, seemed to be well received by many delegates. There was a storm of applause as he was leaving the rostrum.

At the evening session representative of democratic and Marxist platforms will deliver their reports.

TASS Reports on Opening of Conference

*LD1906101290 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT
19 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Russian Communist Party conference was opened today in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses by Soviet Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who is also chairman of the Central Committee of Russian Bureau.

Gorbachev said that, in compliance with the Central Committee's decision, 2,768 delegates of the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress elected from the Russian Federation are participants in the conference. A total of 2,744 delegates had arrived in Moscow by Tuesday morning.

The conference formed its working bodies—a presidium, a secretariat, editing and auditing commissions—and adopted the agenda, including two issues—on the current situation and the foundation of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and on the draft platform of the Soviet Communist Party for its 28th congress and draft party rules.

During the discussion, some delegates suggested the discussion of platforms alternative to the Central Committee platform, first of all, the democratic and the Marxist platforms. Delegates agreed that the platforms' representatives should make brief reports after the main report made by Gorbachev.

Formation of Russian Communist Party Discussed

*LD1906074690 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT
19 Jun 90*

[By TASS observer Igor Yefimov]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Communists of the Russian Federation gathered in Moscow today to reestablish a Communist Party in the Soviet Union's largest republic after 65 years.

The Russian Communist Party, which dates back to the end of the 19th century, was integrated into the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) in 1925.

As distinct from communists in other Soviet republics, which have preserved their communist parties headed by their own central committees, the Russian communists, who make up 58 per cent of the CPSU membership, have

been deprived of republican structures. The CPSU Central Committee directly rules regional party organisations.

In the years of perestroika, as national self-consciousness has rapidly developed in all Soviet republics, including Russia, Russians raised the issue of restoring (or founding—communists still argue about the term) the Russian Communist Party.

The centre did not rush to support the idea. Late last year, a Russian bureau was set up at the CPSU Central Committee. The Bureau, headed by Mikhail Gorbachev, was intended to fulfil the functions of a Russian Central Committee.

However, the majority of Russian communists described the move as a half-measure.

Then the CPSU Central Committee convened a Russian Communist Party Conference to decide whether or not Russia should have a communist party of its own.

Some organisations interpreted this position of the centre as a delaying tactic.

In late April, Russian communists gathered in Leningrad for what they described as an "initiative congress of a Russian Communist Party." They called for the revival of the party.

In early June, about 600 Russian communists gathered for the second stage of the congress. They reiterated their determination to set up a Russian Communist Party, within the CPSU.

Simultaneously, the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and an official preparatory committee were working on this issue.

It was decided that the Russian Party conference would be attended by delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, elected from the Russian Federation. The CPSU Congress will open in early July.

The conference is expected to be held in two stages. In the current, first stage, the Russian Communist Party will most likely be proclaimed and its leadership elected.

Then, after the CPSU Congress, policy documents will be worked out and the party's rules adopted.

No one doubts that the Russian Communist Party will be set up. The question is, what policies will it adopt?

CPSU Officials View Possible Russian Party

LD1906065790 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT
19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Conference of Russian Communists which opened here today seems certain to end in the formation of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation as part and parcel of the Soviet

Communist Party (CPSU). Several major party organisations of this largest soviet republic, now directly incorporated in the all-Union party, as well as many political trends within it, support the idea.

Meeting journalists on Monday, Moscow city party chief Yuriy Prokofyev said Moscow's delegation would call for the immediate formation of the Communist Party of Russia. He expressed the view of the Moscow City Party Conference, which ended here last week.

The desire to have a Russian Communist Party is dictated not only by the wish of Russian communists to have an organisational structure, enjoyed by party members in the other 14 constituent republics. It is also explained by their search for ways to renovate and reform the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a whole.

This is borne out also by the fact that Moscow communists believe that the adoption of the rules of the Russian Communist Party and the election of its leadership should take place only after the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and proceeding from its results.

The demand to renovate the party was also voiced by the conference of the Leningrad party organisation, which ended in June. In its statement, the conference demanded that the Soviet Communist Party should be rid of state functions and be turned into "a party of civil peace in conditions of political pluralism and society's radical renovation."

A similar demand was voiced by the national conference of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" in Moscow on Saturday. The Russian regional section of this movement published a resolution on the need to set up a new Russian political party of a parliamentary type. The Democratic Platform favours a voluntary union of republican parties on federative lines.

CPSU Secretary Andrey Girenko told a press conference here on Monday that the possible candidates for the post of leader of the Russian Communist Party include Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yuriy Mananenkov.

Girenko believes the new party will help Russian communists positively influence the Soviet Communist Party as a whole. At the same time, Girenko called for party unity throughout the country.

Moscow CPSU Chief on Genesis of Russian Party

LD1806154390 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT
18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kirill Dibrova]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—"The Moscow delegation will demand the immediate institution of a communist party of the Russian federation at Russia's party conference opening in Moscow on June 19," leader of

the Moscow party committee Yuriy Prokofyev told a news conference at the Moscow Communist Party committee today.

The news conference was devoted to the results of last week's conference of Moscow communists. Prokofyev said that the Moscow communists had worked out a joint position on the eve of two party forums (Russia's party conference and the 28th Congress of the CPSU).

"We believe that it is more reasonable to adopt the rules of a Russian Communist Party and elect its leadership after the 28th Congress of the CPSU on the basis of its decisions," Prokofyev went on to say.

He said that at the party congress the Moscow delegation will propose that the congress personally assess the activities of each Politburo member and secretaries of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

The Moscow communists believe that many senior party officials committed major errors and miscalculations already in the period of perestroika and that it is impossible to elect a new CPSU leadership without objectively assessing the work of the Politburo and the Central Committee in recent years.

Moscow TV Relays 18 June Congress Proceedings

Agenda Announced

LD1806172790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 18 June begins carrying a recording of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin.

A screen caption reads "Morning Session." Video shows the deputies taking their places. Boris Yeltsin calls on them to rise for the RSFSR flag. They do so. Yeltsin then asks them to register: 773 are present; a quorum is 707.

At 1618 GMT Yeltsin announces the agenda: confirmation of the prime minister; confirmation of an arbiter; a decree on authority; a debate on the mass media.

Yeltsin asks for birthday greetings for Isayev, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

At 1620 GMT Yeltsin makes two announcements concerning the formation of groups to study two questions: The presence of troops in the south of the country; and the problem of refugees.

At 1622 GMT Yeltsin invites brief interventions on miscellaneous subjects: Rakov from Ulyanovsk speaks about health-care shortcomings and shortages of medicines, and calls for an early debate.

At 1624 GMT Rodionov, a farmer from Kuban, speaks about the problems of transporting grain and the need for compensation for losses incurred thereby. Yeltsin

says that the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers is due to address the congress on this subject, possibly on Wednesday when the congress next convenes.

At 1627 GMT (Vostanovich) voices concern over delays in passing proper powers to soviets of people's deputies; this needs to be done quickly so that pressing social problems can be dealt with. He therefore wants a debate covering this area at the congress.

At 1633 GMT Kuznetsov raises the question of the status of people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet, a problem which has been highlighted in a newspaper article which has been widely circulated at the congress. Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether the matter should be studied. He says the result is in favor—no figures are given.

At 1636 GMT a Novosibirsk deputy makes additional remarks about deputies' status, about their entitlements to certain services.

At 1639 GMT Struchkov from Chelyabinsk recalls two serious rail accidents in Chelyabinsk Oblast and calls for proceedings against those responsible, and recognition and compensation for casualties.

At 1641 GMT (Pyl) complains that the debate two days ago on people's control was not properly concluded, and says that a commission is needed to study its implications.

At 1642 GMT Peruanskiy, an academic from Kazan, suggests the declaration on sovereignty was taken at the wrong time and does not represent a proper guarantee for the national interests of some peoples.

At 1645 GMT two deputies try to take the podium microphone but Yeltsin tells them the time is up. They remain adamant, then one returns to his place. Eventually, after further insistence by Yeltsin, the second also returns to his seat.

At 1646 GMT Yeltsin says it is time for the first point on the agenda: Confirmation of Silayev as chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. Silayev is to speak for 30 minutes, followed by 30 minutes of questions. This procedure is agreed by a vote.

At 1648 GMT Silayev comes to the microphone.

Silayev Speaks

LD1806175490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1648 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin.

At 1648 GMT Silayev begins speaking. He thanks deputies for nominating him, then begins to expound the program. He says that very serious problems face the republic's government and radical solutions are needed.

The declaration on RSFSR sovereignty provides a basis for this. An economic mechanism guaranteeing economic independence within the USSR is required, but first work on the new Union treaty must be completed, before the end of the year. The new arrangements must ensure no interference by the Union authorities in the republic's economic affairs.

At 1652 GMT Silayev continues, stating that in the past the RSFSR has effectively subsidised other Union republics through the USSR budget system. This year the government will take definite measures to right the imbalance. New cooperation arrangements must be devised between enterprises, farms, etc. and local authorities, making full use of local and republican budgets.

At 1655 GMT he says that many suggestions exist about how the transition to the market economy should be accomplished—for instance the so-called "500 days program." We hope to draft a program for the republic within the next two months, and we would hope to begin the process of transition early next year. Prices of course will change but this should not be at the expense of the people, especially the less well-off, for whom we need to ensure good supplies of basic necessities. A system of indexing of prices to pensions, grants, etc. will also be required. Taxation will be a further element in this process.

At 1700 GMT he observes that it is necessary to stimulate economic activity, especially in the consumer goods field. The government intends to look at privatising small-scale enterprises and forms of economic activity in services, light and agricultural-processing industries. But the Supreme Soviet will have to give its approval.

At 1702 GMT he says that social, cultural, health-care and similar area require close attention. The countryside, in particular, requires attention. This would also include restraining prices of farm equipment and eliminating debts in this area. Road building and rural construction bases need attention. We need to ensure the supply of the necessary agricultural equipment within three to four years, and we are looking at mixed agricultural-industrial structures for this.

At 1705 GMT he remarks that things cannot wait. We have to make sure this year's harvest—expected to be not bad—is properly gathered. We shall provide additional equipment if necessary.

At 1707 GMT he notes that more technical investment is required for various industries, and for this special-purpose funds will have to be created. Special funds will also be created for educational development. Provision will be made for refugees, Afghan veterans.

At 1710 GMT he states that these plans will work only if we make rational and efficient use of our resources. This means overcoming the old structures. For instance, we shall set up a state committee for the republic's economy, to replace the state planning, supply and pricing bodies,

and to meet the needs of a market economy. Over 20 special industry ministries and committees will be abolished. All ministries should be subordinate only to the Russian parliament—deputies applaud—and this will have to be taken into account by the new Union treaty.

At 1714 GMT he says that in order to inform people properly in connection with these changes Russia needs its own media. Silayev states that the job he has taken on is not easy but he is prepared to make every effort, to work with all of them and with Boris Yeltsin—the only place he would dispute with him is on the tennis court. Deputies applaud.

At 1716 GMT Yeltsin announces questions to Silayev.

Deputies Question Silayev

LD1806184290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1717 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. Silayev reads out a number of questions which have been submitted in writing. One is about possible unemployment under the market—he disputes the figures suggested. One is about the cost of military spending—he agrees. One is on curtailing foreign aid—he also agrees.

At 1720 GMT he reads a further question about material and technical provisions, and explains how this will work under the market.

At 1721 GMT a deputy asks about oil and gas prices, and warns about possible effects in Tyumen Oblast. Silayev explains that revenue from foreign sales of oil should return to the producers.

At 1724 GMT a deputy says that the program seems very ordinary, yet the situation requires exceptional measures. Are you sure, he asks, that your program will bring improvements in one or two years? Silayev says he believes in his program.

At 1726 GMT, to a question about clearing up after Chernobyl, Silayev says he approves of what has been done.

At 1727 GMT a deputy from Murmansk reads a telegram from a constituent about living standards and prices. She asks his view on proposed bread prices, and relays a question from a health worker about rates of pay. Silayev says he believes bread prices need to be raised, but he accepts that it may be painful and that therefore further consultation is needed.

At 1730 GMT a deputy from Kemerovo asks a question about the effect of all-Union enterprises affecting the true rate of outflow of funds from the republic, and asks what the rate of taxation should be. Silayev questions the figures suggested in the first question, and says the rate of taxation still needs to be discussed.

At 1733 GMT Silayev reads a further written question about oil and gas prices, then realizes he has already answered it. He picks up a question about farm machinery provision, and explains how he thinks this will work.

At 1736 GMT Silayev reads and comments on a question about the social development of certain towns that have grown up around specific industrial enterprises.

At 1738 GMT a deputy suggests that a consultative group of leaders of enterprises should be set up with which the prime minister would consult. Silayev says he is open to the formation of such consultative forums. To a second question, about foreign trade relations and licenses, he says this should be regulated at the level of the republic, not by the Union authorities.

At 1740 GMT a deputy suggests setting up a committee to deal with oil and fuel matters.

At 1741 GMT a deputy says that in view of Silayev's former membership of the USSR Government, he does not have the moral right to head the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic government, and suggests that in his previous job in charge of an aviation industry enterprise he did little that was useful for the country. Silayev defends himself against these accusations.

At 1744 GMT a deputy from Naberezhnyye Chelny asks several questions. Silayev replies to one about his party membership, referring deputies to the Russian Party Conference opening tomorrow. To the second, about handing land to peasants, he reaffirms his adherence to this.

At 1748 GMT Yeltsin says that time for questions is over, and announces 30 minutes of debate; deputies are to have a maximum of three minutes each.

Silayev Confirmed

LD1806192290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1749 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. Barsukov speaks about the costs and problems of road transport, and supports Silayev for prime minister.

At 1752 GMT Deputy Soy endorses Silayev's thoughts about eliminating rural debt.

At 1755 GMT Matochkin speaks about foreign economic activity, saying it should be one of the areas that leads economic development. More industrial goods need to be brought in. He thinks free enterprise zones also have an important part to play, but there are attendant problems, for instance that of closed regions—this applies to Kaliningrad Oblast.

At 1759 GMT Samoylov refers to a meeting he attended as member of a group of teachers, with Silayev. He thinks the Union authorities have a disproportionate

effect on educational decision-making, but he feels that Silayev is sufficiently radical to carry through the needed changes.

At 1802 GMT Vasilyev announces himself as the representative of a group of independent deputies who support Silayev for the premiership, though Vasilyev says he has certain personal doubts considering Silayev's previous career. On Silayev's plans for reducing the number of ministries, he thinks the whole structure of the government needs to be recreated from scratch. He also wants to see a specific mention in the republic's budget of certain military costs, including those of providing for Afghan veterans.

At 1805 GMT Safronov, from Chuvashia, complains about the lack of investment for roads and construction in his region, and calls for special programs. He ends with an expression of support for Silayev.

At 1809 GMT Novikov calls for the deideologization of the economy. Management bodies in the republic need more non-party people. He supports Silayev.

At 1812 GMT Dmitriyev accuses the central government of not being able to take the country out of the economic crisis. He says that Silayev is also partly responsible for the present state of Russia, in view of the positions he has held in the past. Cruel measures are now necessary to improve things in the country, and he doubts Silayev's capability to undertake and introduce these measures.

At 1815 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on confirming Silayev as prime minister. The figures are: 699 for, 137 against, and 39 abstentions. So Silayev is confirmed as the Russian prime minister. Yeltsin congratulates him on his appointment.

At 1817 GMT Silayev thanks the deputies for voting him into his new position, and promises to do all he can to realize the program of true sovereignty for Russia.

At 1818 GMT Yeltsin reads out a decision to take into account Silayev's program, and instructs the government to draft immediate measures to improve the economy. The Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR is to take into account the proceedings of the present congress and the proposals of the people's deputies. The vote on adopting this decision is: 788 for, 42 against, and 14 abstentions.

At 1821 GMT various announcements are made. The morning session ends.

Decree on Power Debated

LD1806195290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1822 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. The afternoon session is announced. Yeltsin is still in the chair.

At 1822 GMT Lenkova asks about a document which has been distributed among the deputies by media workers during the interval.

At 1823 GMT the draft decree on power is to be discussed. A vote taken on the length of time to be given to this discussion: 30 minutes. No quorum is obtained, so the decision is not adopted.

At 1826 GMT a deputy is unsure of what is now happening, and asks for an explanation. Yeltsin explains the procedure.

At 1827 GMT Deputy Semyonov from Kaliningrad reports on the work of the commission concerned with preparing a draft decree on power. In his opinion, the draft needs further development and pondering on; however, no amendments were received by the commission in written form. The commission has introduced certain compromises into the draft, which have been issued to the deputies for their consideration.

At 1832 GMT Semyonov continues, saying that the document does not cover the whole area of people's power. Some articles of the declaration on the state sovereignty of the RSFSR are concerned with people's power, and where it resides. A commission should be formed, or a committee be instructed, to consider the question of the machinery for people's power.

At 1837 GMT a deputy raises a procedural question. He thinks half an hour is not enough to discuss this document. Yeltsin disagrees, saying that only eight deputies have requested to speak on this issue. A repeat vote on the debating procedure is taken. This time, a decision is adopted, as there is now a quorum.

At 1840 GMT deputies raise further procedural questions.

At 1842 GMT Deputy Varov, author of an alternative draft, says that the question of authority and to whom it belongs is of the greatest importance. He therefore wants to comment on the work of the commission of which he was a member. He is extremely dissatisfied with it, and resigned from it. He says that a dictatorship of the party apparatus exists today. The Soviet Union is now a lesser superpower; glasnost is a surrogate for freedom of expression; and he calls on the deputies who are in favor of the freedom of the people to vote for the draft decree which he and others have devised.

At 1847 GMT Yeltsin says there are three documents under consideration, and now the author of the third draft is to be given the floor.

At 1849 GMT Deputy Krasavchenko says that his document is not an alternative to the draft decree on power, but amendments to Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution.

At 1850 GMT Yeltsin says that there are therefore two decrees on power: Semyonov's and Varov's. One of these must be adopted as a basis for further development.

At 1851 GMT Deputy Nemtsov discusses how the first draft decree was drawn up. He says that the party's power replaces, in part, state power. This situation must end for there to be real people's power. Power must reside in the soviets. Party committees should be removed from the workplace, as they only interfere in the production process.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Kubiyeu talks of the difficulties of separating party and state power. He talks of difficulties in his constituency in attempting to do this. He supports the position of Deputy Nemtsov. He says that the position of autonomous oblasts in the RSFSR is at a very low level.

At 1909 GMT Deputy Katenkov asks that his amendments, which the relevant commission has, be taken into account in further development of the draft decree. Power lies in the people, and is exercised by the soviet of people's deputies. The supreme power lies in the Congress of People's Deputies. No parties or organizations are to be allowed to interfere in the work of the soviets, and such organizations or parties should be banned by the soviet if interference is attempted. The decree should be in force from the moment that it is adopted.

Decree Vote Noted

LD1806215290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1910 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. Grachev speaks about local, rural problems before coming to the question of the decree on power. He favors a resolution rather than a decree.

At 1912 GMT Krasavchenko makes a number of further points, emphasizing the need to avoid all monopolies of power.

At 1915 GMT Zadonskiy says he favors Varov's document. He says when considering how power is held, one should recall how the Bolsheviks took power, and emphasizes the importance of safeguarding the media from control by one party or group, proposing that the document make special mention of the media. He proposes alternative forms of wording to encompass this.

At 1921 GMT Kamchatov says he would like all the various proposals just aired put to the vote, and makes a further proposal concerning the formation of armed forces and security forces by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

At 1925 GMT Yeltsin sums up the situation so far: There are three documents—the draft proposed by the subcommission, presented by Semenov; the draft decree presented by Varov; and the document proposed by the non-party group presented by Nemtsov. He invites final remarks on whether there should be a vote.

At 1928 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks for the Varov document. Chernyshev and Solov'yev both suggest

there are too many versions to try to reconcile, and the commission should be asked to come up with a new version.

At 1930 GMT Lubimov says no decree on power should be passed.

At 1931 GMT Gritsenko objects to the way the congress secretariat has handled his requests to speak in the debate. He goes on suggest that the debate should be wound up, and the matter passed to the Supreme Soviet.

At 1933 GMT Varov recalls that his version was sent to the congress on 21 May, and that the subcommission has acted improperly in dismissing his proposals.

At 1935 GMT Bondarev tries to speak, but is ruled out of order by Yeltsin.

At 1936 GMT an Omsk deputy, who was member of the subcommisison, explains how it works.

At 1938 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether to end this round of remarks; it is carried, 776 to 83.

At 1939 GMT Semenov, of the subcommission, recapitulates the versions of the document which are to be voted on.

At 1940 GMT Yeltsin suggests a first vote on the Varov document. A vote is taken on this suggestion, and passed 627 to 231. The Varov draft decree is then to be voted on, first as it stands: it is passed 532 to 353, with 41 abstentions. Amendments are to be voted on next, but first, says Yeltsin, there will be a recess until 1600 hours (1200 GMT).

At 1948 GMT the screen carries the caption: Our Correspondents Report.

The correspondent presents a recorded extract of the news conference given by a group of unnamed people's deputies, three are visible in an unspecified location. Questions deal with, among other things, expectations for the new Union treaty, anticipated relations between Supreme Soviets of the RSFSR and USSR, the place of the RSFSR in a new federation, and how the center will be viewed.

At 1953 GMT the recording of the RSFSR Congress session resumes. Deputies are seen assembling.

Zarubin Outlines Program

LD1806221490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2000 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. Yeltsin says that, having approved the Varov draft decree as a basis, amendments to it now have to be voted on. However, he warns, there are a very large number of these, and the process is likely to become lengthy. He suggests that before proceeding a vote should be taken on whether to

instruct the Constitutional Commission to prepare draft amendments to the republic's Constitution which will be necessary to prevent conflict with the decree on power. He further proposes that the numerous amendments should not be voted on now; rather, the drafting commission should try to amalgamate them into a smaller number and bring back its proposals at the next sitting on Wednesday. This suggestion is voted on, and passed 735 to 130.

At 2012 GMT Makeyev objects to the procedure that has been used.

At 2014 GMT Tikhonov objects that the numerous amendments are not available in printed form to the whole body of deputies.

At 2016 GMT Makeyev again raises an objection to the voting procedure.

At 2019 GMT Mozayev adds doubts about the procedure to be used for voting amendments.

At 2020 GMT Tikhonov thinks the amendments should be voted on.

At 2021 GMT Shashkov thinks the whole issue should be returned to at the next congress session.

At 2024 GMT a deputy says that this is a constitutional question, and should be approached through amendments to the Constitution. He is applauded.

At 2025 GMT Yeltsin proposes terminating the procedural discussion, and calls for a vote on this: it is passed 748 to 108. End of this point of the agenda.

At 2029 GMT Yeltsin announces the next point on the agenda: the endorsement of Zarubin as RSFSR state arbiter. He proposes a timetable for Zarubin to speak and answer questions, and calls for a vote to approve this: the timetable is approved, 709 to 27. Zarubin is invited to speak.

At 2031 GMT Zarubin thanks everyone for the confidence implied in his nomination. He says he is not going to change his plans for the post from those he proposed two days ago, but will add one or two clarifications. He intends to see that state arbitration services function in all autonomous areas. He gives some numerical data on the service's activities.

Meanwhile, there is considerable noise in the chamber and Yeltsin calls on deputies to hear Zarubin more respectfully.

Zarubin resumes with an account of the service's activities over the last year, and the economic benefits this has represented. He refers to the changes in the arbitration service's activities in the changing economic situation, and says that all continuity in its work must not, however, be lost. He ends with an appeal to deputies to give their support to the state arbitration service and thus bolster its prestige.

Zarubin moves on to replying to written questions, dealing with, among other things, setting the levels of fines, his previous career in the RSFSR procuracy, and his credentials for the post for which he has been nominated.

At 2043 GMT Alekseyev asks a question about the possible need to reorganize the arbitration service. Zarubin says the service's officers have a very heavy workload, and some areas of dispute may be removed from their competences.

At 2046 GMT a deputy from Maritime Kray asks about the main work of the arbitration service: Zarubin says it concerns ensuring compliance with contractual obligations. To a second question, he says he has never known cases of the service's officers being pressured by party officials.

At 2048 GMT Pankov asks a question about possible conflict between functions of the service and the courts. Zarubin delivers his thoughts on this subject.

At 2049 GMT a deputy from Omsk asks how Zarubin can claim to operate according to his conscience when he has served under previous Soviet regimes. He defends his record.

Zarubin Nomination Debated

LD1806223190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2050 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. (?Kharitonov) asks a question about the danger of monopoly activity. Zarubin replies.

At 2051 GMT an unidentified deputy asks Zarubin to cite some examples of his defense of Russian interests against central bodies. He says he cannot cite shining examples, but there have been some cases.

At 2053 GMT Yeltsin announces a debate on the nomination.

An unidentified deputy comes to the podium microphone, and speaks about examples of unfair monopoly activity by central authorities, against Russian interests, where the arbitration service has not ensured fairness.

At 2059 GMT Travkin comes to the microphone, saying that Zarubin has worked 37 years in state administration posts and has no experience in production. He knows only how to defend the interests of the state. A different sort of man is needed for the new economic times.

At 2101 GMT Deputy (?Dolmina) says that she is against the appointment of Zarubin, because his past is so murky and, in essence, no one knows anything about his past work. His program does not reveal how he thinks the arbitrator's office will be restructured.

At 2103 GMT a deputy complains about the noise in the hall, which interferes with the speakers.

At 2105 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on the confirmation of Zarubin in his new office. The vote is 487 for, 358 against, and 43 abstentions; the appointment is thus not confirmed, as the necessary majority was not achieved.

At 2107 GMT a deputy calls for a choice of candidates. A second deputy agrees with this.

At 2108 GMT Yeltsin says that the Supreme Soviet will return to the discussion of further candidates for the post of state arbiter.

At 2110 GMT Yeltsin says that the next item on the agenda concerns the mass media. He says that it should possibly be discussed on Wednesday.

At 2112 GMT Deputy Vasiliyev from the secretariat reads out various proposals that have been made, which have still to be considered. He announces the registration of another group, the radical democrats, coordinated by People's Deputy Yushenkov.

At 2115 GMT Yeltsin complains about the way the deputies are behaving themselves during the sitting. He calls for the deputies to register to establish who has disappeared. There are 895 deputies present.

At 2117 GMT Deputy Oleynik, speaking on behalf of the majority of Moscow deputies, says that they are standing on a platform of human values and peace. Recently citizens at the Hotel Rossiya have been stirring up extremism, talking of the threat of civil war. They condemn such actions, and demand that the bodies of law and order use the appropriate laws to halt this, as such demonstrations have nothing in common with democracy.

At 2121 GMT Deputy Kuzayev says that N. Osetiya was hit by a natural disaster last week, and has received no support. He complains about some deputies being given the floor more often than others.

At 2125 GMT Deputy Sizenko, in answer to a request from Krasnodar Kray deputies, talks about the supply of fuel to that kray. He quotes figures concerning the supplies.

At 2131 GMT a deputy says that the population of Russia is expecting quick decisions. He says that measures are necessary to ensure that Russia is supplied with necessary consumer goods. A decision should be made to improve matters in this sphere, and this will be welcomed by the Russian population.

At 2135 GMT Yeltsin says that a decision has been made to have an extraordinary session of deputies in September, on agricultural questions. He now suggests that some resolutions on the question of food supplies be drawn up.

At 2136 GMT Deputy Loginov again raises the question of the discipline of deputies, and relates it to discipline in the workplace.

At 2139 GMT Yeltsin says that instructions could be given today to the government, to take urgent measures to improve the food supply situation. This proposal is voted on: 824 are for, 20 are against, and there are 14 abstentions. So the proposal is adopted.

At 2142 GMT Deputy Dorofeyev suggests that in order for the work of the parliament to be more effective, certain procedural changes should be introduced, and a commission for procedural matters should be formed.

Mass Media Law Proposed

LD1806224590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2146 GMT on 18 June continues to carry a recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session held in the Kremlin. Yeltsin returns to the question of the mass media, and then to the confirmation of the chairman of the Supreme Court and the status of peoples deputies—all to be on the agenda on Wednesday. Tomorrow, both chambers of the Supreme Soviet will be working. At 1600 [1200 GMT] tomorrow, there will be a joint session.

At 2149 GMT Yeltsin reads a deputy's proposal that the congress no longer be called a congress, as this indicates its temporary nature, but now be called a Duma (old pre-revolutionary parliament). Other deputies' notes are read out.

At 2152 GMT Yeltsin returns yet again to the mass media. He introduces one proposal that a law on the Russian mass media be approved. In the meantime, he says that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Council of Ministers have the right to be the co-publishers of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. A vote is taken on how to vote on this. The vote is to be by name. The motion is carried: 876 vote in favor, nine vote against, and there are 15 abstentions.

At 2158 GMT Yeltsin says that the decision on the need for measures to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident has not yet been published. It will be published tomorrow.

At 2159 GMT an unnamed deputy raises a point about the decision: It included a mention of Ryazan Oblast, which is not affected, so that should be deleted. Yeltsin refers the matter to the Editorial Commission. Another deputy clarifies the point. The Editorial Commission decides to leave the document in its original form.

At 2202 GMT a women deputy from Leningrad refers to a Council of Ministers and All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions decision on benefits for the victims of Chernobyl, and asks whether the RSFSR is ready for this.

At 2205 GMT an unidentified deputy cites the nuclear waste damage caused in Chelyabinsk Oblast during the fifites. Yeltsin says the decision has already been adopted: must it be adopted a second time?

At 2206 GMT there are various deputies' announcements.

At 2207 GMT the recorded relay of the congress proceedings ends. Correspondents' interviews with deputies follows in the foyer. Yu.N. Polyakov gives his impressions of the congress. M.A. Bocharov speaks on his feelings following the election of Silayev as chairman of the Council of Ministers; he does not regard it as a defeat, but does not feel as though he could work as first deputy chairman of the government. He is prepared to help, but not as a member of the government. Deputy S.M. Shakhrai speaks about the need for facilities supporting the work of deputies.

At 2219 GMT the program ends.

Silayev Addresses 18 June RSFSR Congress

LD1806212190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1648 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Address by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, premier-designate of the RSFSR, from the morning proceedings of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies 18 June session, held in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade People's Deputies! First of all, I would like to express profound gratitude to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, which has appointed me to the high post of chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. But I understand that the final decision is made by the congress. I will therefore try, from this responsible platform, to describe to you the most important and most principled directions of the program of action of the future government. Besides that, I understand that you also have questions for me personally. I will not pass those by, either.

A task of extraordinary complexity lies upon the republic's new government: that of implementing measures of a kind which will make it possible to haul the Russian Federation and its economy out of the present situation of crisis. This must be a competent and well-considered policy, and at the same time one that is radical and forward-looking. I understand that already we have no time left to get into the swing, to make estimates and experiments. The foundation for the implementation of such a policy is given by the declaration on the state sovereignty of the RSFSR, which has been adopted by you.

A most important aspect of the government's activity will be the development of economic machinery which guarantees the genuine economic independence of Russia, as a sovereign state in the body of the USSR. The solution of this problem is impossible without a renewal

of the Soviet Federation, based on a new Union treaty. It is extremely desirable that this new treaty should be concluded before the end of the current year. The treaty must guarantee the republic's economic independence by endorsing its title to its land, its mineral resources, and its budget revenues—and also the republic's exclusive right to regulate internal, public, and socioeconomic dimensions of development. At the same time, the precise reallocation of legislative and executive power between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Russian Federation, ensuring that Union bodies do not interfere within the competence of the republic, will become the foundation of effective work by the government for implementing the independent economic policy which is being worked out by the legislative bodies of power.

The existing non-equivalent and extremely distorted exchange of goods between republics has led essentially to the concealed financing of other Union republics out of the Russian budget. Judge for yourselves. In recent years the contributions in terms of resources of the republic to the Union fund of state-wide resources have amounted to over R100 billion. Only slightly over R30 billion is returned from the Union budget. Calculations show that a closer application of worked prices in economic relations between the republics would give the budget of the Russian Federation's national economy about R25 billion in additional resources. In this connection, already this year the government will be taking essential steps to even out the present imbalance in accounting between the republics.

An important condition for strengthening the republic's sovereignty is the complete economic freedom of all producers within its territory. To this end it is essential that all enterprises be granted to the legislative right no later than the end of this year, to opt out of administrative and departmental control from above and to make their own choice of organizational structures and forms of ownership, regulated by law, including private ownership.

The mutual relations between economically independent agricultural and industrial enterprises will be built on the basis of their common interest in the socioeconomic development of villages, rayons, and towns, by way of the taxation system and the implementation of joint social programs and strict observance of local laws. We will thereby, by breaking down the wall of alienation that has grown up between local bodies of power and goods producers—and furthermore by giving them an economic interest to help one another—create real prerequisites for the self-government and self-financing of all autonomous formations, krays, and oblasts.

This involves the independent formation and utilization of republican and local budgets, with the lower-level budgets being wholly independent of those at a higher level. Under this condition alone, we will be able to

ensure the independence and responsibility of republican and local bodies in everything relating to satisfying peoples' needs and demands. And only in close interaction with the councils of ministers of the autonomous republics, with kray and oblast executive committees, and with the executive committees of autonomous oblast executive committees, and with the executive committees of autonomous oblasts and okrugs, will the government of the Russian Federation be able successfully to fulfill the tasks it has been set.

A most important question, which the government will tackle first, is working out a mechanism whereby the national economy can be put on a market footing. In the interests of our republic's economy, this has to be done right now, since sovereignty gives us not just economic freedom but also additional financial, monetary, material, and technical resources, which we badly need in order to start off the process.

There are many proposals and concepts for a transition to the market. The program drafted by a number of economists, codenamed 500 days, is also of serious interest. We have embarked on active cooperation with its authors, and have agreed with them on mutual adaptation, within one month, of our outline plans, as the main ideas are geared to the same objectives. This will enable us, within two months, to draft a republican program for a transition to market relations and to submit it to the Russian Supreme Soviet.

I appeal to people's deputies and specialists who have suggestions for improving the mechanism, no matter how radical: Put them forward and we will discuss them.

The program must of necessity be enshrined in legislation. In order to speed up its implementation, it is essential to prepare and adopt the appropriate legislative acts, in order to actively begin, as soon as the start of next year, the process of introducing market relations. I would like to emphasize here especially that this aspect is in no way connected with an increase in retail prices—for this ideas will not reduce the shortage of goods. At the same time, in due course, the general structure of prices will inevitably change under the influence of the market. But none of this should be to the detriment of the people's interests, at the people's expense.

One of the means of protecting the interests of the population, and in particular of the needy strata of the population, should be the introduction of the tax we have proposed, which secures the continued production and sale of cheap ranges of goods, such as footwear, clothing, tableware, furniture, and so on. In addition, indexation of prices will be carried out, and the incomes of the population will be brought into line with these: first and foremost pensions, stipends, allowances, and the wages of the low-paid categories of working people.

People's Deputies Comrades Anikin, Mikhaylov, Onikeyev, and many others have rightly insisted upon this in their speeches.

And so taxation policy; prices; a state order that is advantageous and backed up by financial and material and technical resources; independent access to the external market; and the opening of the internal market for foreign firms will be elements of the economic reforms. The provision of incentives for scientific and technical progress through direct state investments and through an interest on the part of enterprises in investing resources in innovations is no less important an element in the reform. All of this is aimed at raising incentives for economically free enterprises and for increasing production of goods and their sales, which will lead to a turning point in the economic situation in the republic and primarily in the consumer market.

World practice shows that the greatest effect is achieved—and within a short time period—through the privatization of enterprises in various spheres of the economy. The government has in mind to provide in the program for handing over to private ownership small enterprises in the servicing and consumer goods production sectors; in domestic construction materials; in the processing of agricultural products; and in others—provided of course, that it is supported by the Supreme Soviet.

According to our calculations, this turn toward improvement will be felt by people in one and a half to two years' time.

The overall scale of the problems that have accumulated in Russia is such that no matter how acute they are, it is essential to choose the most important ones and the shortest possible time for resolving them, to concentrate maximum effort and resources upon them. Among such problems the people's deputies cite the food problem; the ecological and social problem, including housing; public health; people's education; science and the university; and the development of the culture and individuality of all Russians. That is my position, too.

But the main one of these is the revival of the countryside. A specific program for this will be submitted at your next congress. The government will not delay in submitting proposals to the people's deputies for changing the system of taxing agricultural production; for a uniform tax on land which takes into account its economic valuation; and for preventing price increases in agricultural equipment bought by collective and state farms. I reiterate what I said in my report to the Supreme Soviet session about the elimination of debts and, as a priority measure, the suspension of the payment of deductions. [applause]

The program for the rebirth of the countryside will be backed upon the required scale by state capital investment for the development of the social infrastructure, and in the first place for the construction of roads; for the provision of gas and electricity supplies; for communications; and for the development of the rural construction industry. [applause]

The provision of credits on concessionary terms for the development of the production base of the countryside will be envisaged. Particularly favorable support will be given to those wanting to participate in the rebirth of abandoned lands and villages in the Russian Federation, including the transfer of these lands into private ownership.

We will conduct a policy of giving wide incentives for setting up mixed agro-industrial structures. The first of these have been set up with the participation of machine builders in Krasnodar Kray and Kalinin Oblast. We will also develop the network of enterprises for storage and reprocessing of agricultural produce in the places where it is produced. We will do everything possible to resolve, within two to four years, the problem of equipping rural areas with the necessary agricultural machinery, by making use on a wide scale of the capacities of both civilian and defense machine-building enterprises, giving economic incentives for its manufacture, and also developing the machine and equipment servicing network.

The government envisages handing over to local rural soviets all budget funds allocated within the context of this program to provide for social needs, specifically for this purpose. But it is necessary right away, without waiting for a congress decision, to draw up and adopt a number of urgent measures aimed first and foremost at conserving and processing this year's harvest. According to the forecasts of rural dwellers—as has already been mentioned here—a pretty good harvest is expected. The Council of Ministers will take the most decisive measures possible to ensure that the agro-industrial complex is supplied with fuel and lubricants, rubber and accumulators, and other materials in short supply, and also with spare parts.

I consider it fundamentally important that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin backed my proposal to include in the government the chairman of the Peasants' Union.

We will find the opportunity to supply agriculture in the near future with additional machinery, transport, and equipment.

The empty shelves in stores selling manufactured goods are another acute problem. In order to ease the shortage of goods, we are prepared to make purchases, including ones from abroad. The main thrust of our policy, however, will be to increase investment roughly threefold, and to modernize over 300 enterprises in the light and textile industries. Enshrined here, as in all the other programs I have described, will be the principle of economic incentives and the interest of all those involved in implementing the programs.

I take the liberty of reiterating what I said in my report at the sitting of the Supreme Soviet: In spite of all its wealth of resources, in spite of the scale of development of its scientific and manufacturing potential, Russia's national economy will only be receptive to the achievements of scientific and technical progress when the

economic mechanism gives enterprises an interest not only in investing their resources in innovations, but also in earning a profit by doing so. In these conditions, state investment may make up 40-50 percent of the total amount of research and development. Such a policy has enabled developed countries to get to the top in the competitive struggle in the world market, and to attain a high standard of living.

It is clear that we will have to resolve all Russia's problems at the expense of our own resources. We will have to seek these out, too, in order to set up special-purpose funds. This will help even out the socioeconomic development of the regions, and primarily of the Non-Chernozem zone, Siberia, the North, and the Far East.

The question of eliminating the backwardness of the socioeconomic development of the national-ethnic formations [Russnatsionalnyye obrazovaniya] confronts us in an especially acute manner. With this aim, the government will set up a special fund for national-ethnic revival; special-purpose spending from this fund will be carried out together with the people's deputies.

Serious attention will be given to the problems of providing for refugees and to the creation of normal housing conditions for Afghan veterans and for servicemen being discharged into the reserve in connection with the reductions in the Armed Forces. We will do everything to build up the intellectual potential; to preserve the historic heritage and the national originality; to revive culture and morality; and to strengthen the spiritual and physical health of all peoples of the Russian Federation. Proposals will be prepared for raising the social status of the teacher, the doctor, and the engineer, and also the person working in law-enforcement bodies—both in the cultural sphere and by way of improving their material situation.

All of this will be at the center of the government's attention. There are many problems and none of them can be deferred. But our possibilities, too, are considerable, if we labor freely and in an interested way, and if we make effective use of everything that we create.

Esteemed People's Deputies! Insofar as new economic relationships, and the achievements of scientific and technical progress, are being laid as the foundation for the development of the national economy and as the most effective path toward raising the well-being of society, the need also arises for the old structures of government to be replaced. They must not be pulled down, but rather supplanted by new functions, from among those that are needed by the economically free producer and market. For example, we intend to form a state committee for the economy of the republic, based on the State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Labor, the State Committee for Prices, and the State Committee for Statistics. It will have new functions: the study of market conditions, the forecasting of the development of the forces of production, working out the

balance between social product, national income, and financial resources, and so on. At the same time other organs, too, must be created: for the development of small-scale enterprises, lease-contracting, and individual farmers' holdings—and for the provision of state support to these; for the implementation of anti-monopoly policy; for external economic links; for the implementation of the program for the rebirth of the countryside; for the transfer to a market economy; for the management of state property; and others. The State Committee for Material and Technical Supply and its territorial bodies will be transformed from a means of alienating the producer and the consumer into one of the mechanisms of the market, and will become financially autonomous commercial intermediaries.

All in all, the transformation of the structural detachments within the republic's Council of Ministers will lead to the elimination of more than 20 industrial ministries and state committees, while the structures that are left will be considerably simplified.

The question of cooperation between the republic's Council of Ministers and the Union government is a fundamental one. The government of Russia should be answerable only to Russia's parliament [applause], and only in matters to be determined by the Russian parliament will it be guided by the decisions of the USSR Government on the basis of the Union treaty.

Esteemed People's Deputies! It is very important for the government's program to receive the support of the Russian people, and active participation by that people in its implementation. Without mass information media this cannot be done. Consequently, Russia needs its own television, press, and radio. And of course, its own newspaper, which must be the organ of the Supreme Soviet and government of the republic. [passage indistinct] mass information media is an essential condition for the sovereignty of Russia. In the organizational structure of the government we envisage the establishment of the relevant body—a Ministry of Information and Communications.

Now about myself. Like many of you, I have worked under the conditions of the command-and-administer system, but I am not a conservative and never have been one, for I have collected lumps and acquired problems for the sake of innovations.

But I have managed to do a lot, too, and to build up knowledge and experience. Now I find I have an opportunity to take part in the rebirth of Russia upon the principles of the declaration adopted by the congress. I do not think that you will regard as a privileged one the post of head of the republic's government during a period of severe crisis. But I have made my choice without hesitation. It is a simple one: To give the whole of my strength to the rebirth of Russia, to work together with you, to seek and to find the best solutions for the

well-being of Russians. I am counting on close cooperation with the people's deputies and on mutual understanding with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. The only place where I will not strive to find a compromise with him is the tennis court. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

18 June RSFSR Congress Session Summarized

LD1806160990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 18 Jun 90

[TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin report from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, appointed several days ago by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] to the office of chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, made a program speech today at the First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. Answering questions from the deputies, Ivan Silayev spoke in favor of, among other things, creating a reliable system of social guarantees so as to avert a fall in the population's living standards during the transition of Russia's economy to market relations.

After discussing Ivan Silayev's program, the congress confirmed him as head of the Russian government by an overwhelming majority of votes.

During the break between sittings, a joint press conference was held by the chairmen of the chambers of the Russian parliament: Vladimir Isakov and Ramazan Abdulatipov. They discussed the fundamental trends in the activities of the Soviet of the Republic and the Soviet of Nationalities. The journalists showed most interest in the problems of relations between the nationalities. There also was talk of delimiting the competence of the Russian Federation and the USSR in light of the "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the RSFSR" adopted by the congress.

The congress discussed the draft decree on power. This document, submitted by a group of Leningrad deputies, was approved in principle by a majority vote. However, in view of the fact that a great many amendments were made to the text, Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, proposed making these common knowledge and submitting them for examination by the First Congress on Wednesday, 20 June.

There was a surprise in the decision of the congress which failed, by a majority vote, to confirm Nikolay Zarubin as Russia's state arbitrator. He was appointed to that position by the republic's parliament.

Pluralism of opinion was evident at the congress in, for instance, the formation of a great many deputies' groups. The Secretariat today reported the registration of

another group, the 33d in number: the "Radical Democrats" [radikalnyye demokraty]. Fifty-five people's deputies have joined it, and the coordinator of the group is People's Deputy Sergey Yushenkov (Moscow).

A resolution was adopted on the proposal of Boris Yeltsin, confirming the right of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers to be copublishers of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper.

There is a break in the work of the first congress tomorrow. The session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will be continued. The members of parliament will return to their examination of the matter of forming standing committees and commissions.

Resolution Issued on Silayev Appointment

PM1906104390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

["RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on RSFSR Council of Ministers Announcement"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To take cognizance of the RSFSR Council of Ministers announcement on the constitution of its powers vis-a-vis the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.
2. To appoint Comrade Ivan Stepanovich Silayev chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and to charge him with presenting proposals to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the composition of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.
3. That the RSFSR Council of Ministers continue to discharge its duties until the RSFSR Supreme Soviet forms a new RSFSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
B.N. Yeltsin.
Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets.
5 June 1990.

Moscow Commodities Exchange Called 'Major Step'

LD0206171790 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—The City of Moscow, determined to switch to a market economy, has formed the first Soviet commodities exchange.

The presentation of the exchange was held today at the World Trade Centre.

The new establishment was founded by the Soviet Association of Young Managers, the Union of Scientific-Technical Youth Centres, small venture and innovation firms, the Moscow City Executive Committee Department of Supplies and other organisations.

The exchange was set up in an attempt to improve the distribution of much-needed goods, such as construction materials, and is designed as an alternative to the burgeoning black market.

It will help regulate supply and demand and determine realistic prices to attract more commodities to Moscow. This is where trade deals will be struck and legal guarantees obtained.

Moscow City Council representatives attending the ceremony said it was a major step towards promoting market relations in every-day city life.

Sobchak Outlines Program for Leningrad

90UN2069B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 26 May 90 p 2

[Excerpts from Leningrad City Soviet Chairman A.A. Sobchak's speeches and interviews by A. Manilova and T. Chesanova: "The Model of Hope (The Lensovet Chairman on Ways to Revive the City)"]

[Text] At the end of last year the "Reporter On Duty" conducted a contest for the most popular Leningrader. The competition presented us with an unquestionable leader and now this leader, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, became also the Lensovet [Leningrad City Soviet] leader. It seems that for the first time since S.M. Kirov the opinions of the people and of those who speak on their behalf coincided. Our new chairman received something that his predecessors appointed from "above" did not and could not have—the vote of confidence from the Leningraders.

For what purpose was Anatoliy Sobchak "recruited and enlisted" to the Lensovet? For what purpose did we bestow real power on our 400 elected representatives? It was done for the sake of the revival of Leningrad, for the sake of decent life for the great city and its people. So it is only natural that we are searching the program of the Lensovet chairman and his public speeches and interviews primarily for the revival concept, for the model of hope.

This is how the idea was born to single out the basic features of this model which, probably, is not quite complete yet.

ABOUT POWER

I do not agree with those who declare that the USSR Supreme Soviet failed to take authority in our country. Yes, the deputy corps is often being manipulated but the entire sphere of preparing legislation now belongs to the Supreme Soviet.

People often ask me if the Lensovet is capable of taking authority in the city. I think they should rephrase their question: We do not need to take authority but we have to realize the authority already given us by the people. How to realize it is an issue for a concrete concept—a concrete program for developing the life in our city in all its diversity.

HOW TO REALIZE AUTHORITY

The essence of my program is as follows:

- in politics—to transfer to a multiparty system; to strengthen the principles of democratic socialism;
- in social policies—to guarantee social justice and social protection to the people;
- in economy—to follow its multistructural character, to encourage the entrepreneurial spirit and various forms of individual and collective enterprises, to strip the industries of their ideological and political shrouds;
- in ecology—to suspend the dam construction and to decide on its future on the basis of the experts' analysis; to tighten the ecological control over the work of the main military industries;
- in city administration—to rely on the support of the local soviets, to create a unified "rayon-city" system.

STATUS OF THE CITY

Leningrad can become truly independent only when it is given the status of a free economic zone.

We have to redirect our economy so that the production of consumer goods, the service sector, and the solution of social problems become our top priorities. In such a way we will transform our city from the center of a military-industrial complex into the center of science, culture, and international tourism. Here is just one example: Last year Spain earned \$17 billion from tourists alone with two foreign visitors per every citizen.

We should also profit from the beauty of our city; we have to build a commercial foundation under the program for the rescue of our heritage. There are organizations in the West that are quite ready to participate in it. This is the way to help us resolve our most crucial problems without borrowing money from either the republic or the union budget.

THAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE ELECTIONS

We have to understand that every day we are going to face people's ruined lives, injustice, and a flood of complaints. And we are sure to be drowned in all of this if we fail to create a precise and well-defined system for treating the people's personal problems. I am convinced that every constituent should directly address his specific deputy of the rayon soviet or the Lensovet—depending on the importance of his problem. And only in case neither the deputy nor the corresponding parliamentary commission can help, the problem should be addressed to the Soviet.

The voters, by the way, sometimes ignore the elections and as a result they spend a long time without their own deputy. Well, let them blame themselves for that. You

cannot forget the main thing: The Lensovet is the legislator whose primary duty is to define the perspective and the strategy for the development of the city.

OUR NEIGHBORS AND THE "COMMON MARKET"

Nobody has repealed the law on the economic independence of the Baltic republics. Within its limits we, as their neighbors, are going to establish direct, horizontal, and mutually profitable relations with them.

This may be quite promising for the whole country also. Remember the European Common market which, as you know, started with the initiative of six countries. So let us begin our own "common market" with the north-western four. In general, I am a supporter of regional and interregional contacts.

WITH WHOM TO WORK TOGETHER

We will have to put together the Lensovet Ispolkom [executive committee]. On what principle? I am convinced that we have to combine the experienced personnel with the energetic democrats. The latter do not have any experience of management and administration but they came here full of desire to bring radical changes into the situation in the city. Such an initiative is very valuable. For that reason it seems logical to fill the key positions with as many young, enterprising, and of course honest people, as possible. These might be positions related, for instance, to the social life of the city. But in areas like construction, transportation, communications, industries—the ones that need special knowledge—we can better use the experienced personnel. Let the people enrich each other. Life will show who can work and how they do it.

ABOUT RELATIONS WITH THE CENTER...

When I was young I was a mountain climber and I know that you can find a way out of any situation. We will be looking for such "ways" that lead to a constructive and effective dialog with the Center.

The Center, in its turn, needs to get adequate information from Leningrad as it does not always have it. For instance, I had to explain to some members of the President's Council what had really happened at the Leningrad TV station.

Finally, Leningrad is Leningrad. Just now at a session of the Supreme Soviet I reminded the deputies that ever since Peter the Great all the successful and unsuccessful reforms always originated in the city upon the Neva. And everybody who wants to deal with the Lensovet at any level will have to remember this fact.

...AND WITH THE CPSU OBKOM

I would like to hope that there will be no resistance to the Lensovet from the party organs and there will be mutual help and constructive cooperation instead. This hope of

mine is based on the serious renewal of the bureau and of the entire obkom [oblast party committee].

At the same time, of course, we intend to face the CPSU obkom with most crucial issues of property, publishing, and usage of buildings and we intend to have these problems legally resolved. But what I would not want to do is label someone in advance as an enemy. On the contrary, I am calling on all political forces without exception to provide cooperation in the interests of the city.

"I AM A LENINGRADER and that says it all," was A.A. Sobchak's answer to one of the questions at a press conference.

We are Leningraders and that really says it all. Apart from the idea of the city's revival what else can unify us—we being so different—around the first truly democratic Lensovet and its leader?

Chelyabinsk Jail 'Disturbances' Explained

LD1806131890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1226 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Tkachenko]

[Text] Chelyabinsk, 18 Jun (TASS)—Only with troops and the use of firearms was it possible to end the mass disturbances at the investigative isolation prison of the town of Chelyabinsk (Southern Urals). This was reported today at an emergency press conference held at the Internal Affairs Directorate of the Oblast Executive Committee. As a result of the operation carried out on Sunday [17 June] by militia and internal troop personnel, one of the insurgents was killed, two injured, and several militia men hurt.

The journalists were told that when they were being taken outside for their exercise, the convicts from one of the cells attacked the wardens, seized their keys, and released about a thousand prisoners and people on remand. Six wardens were seized as hostages.

The riot organizers, sentenced on several occasions for serious crimes, demanded the opportunity to meet with representatives of the press, the leadership of the Internal Affairs directorate and Procuracy, and with clergy. Such a meeting was organized. A number of conditions were put forward at the meeting to improve conditions for prisoners and those on remand. However, even after the meeting, the hostages were not handed over. The majority of the criminals, armed with home-made weapons, began to smash down the prison's auxiliary buildings, and there were attempts to escape.

It was only after this that the prison leadership took the decision to storm the prison.

A legal investigation is underway into the incident at the Chelyabinsk isolation prison. Criminal proceedings have been instituted.

Casualties Reported

LD1806163190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 18 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: correspondent S. Sergeyev report from Chelyabinsk—first paragraph is "Vremya" presenter's introduction]

[Text] A few days ago, the public was disturbed at reports of a riot by prisoners in investigative isolation block number one in Dnepropetrovsk. Hostages were taken. In Chelyabinsk, too, there is a similar event in an investigative isolation block, also number one, and the very same demands have been put forward: To improve the conditions for holding prisoners. Details in a report from our correspondent:

[Sergeyev] This happened practically in the center of this city of one million people. At roughly 1400 local time, a group of individuals under investigation attacked six guards and took them hostage. This criminal action was led by individuals against whom criminal proceedings are being instituted for serious crimes: murder and armed racketeering.

Having seized the keys, they released more than 1,000 individuals under investigation from their cells. Disorders began in the building. Doors were smashed open; documents were burned.

The Chelyabinsk militia garrison was placed on alert. They urgently and reliably blocked off the territory of the investigative isolation block to insure that those taking part in the disorders could not break out into the city.

Representatives of the law enforcement and party bodies and of the clergy entered into talks with the instigators of the disorders. From the side of those under investigation demands were put forward on improving the conditions for holding individuals in investigative isolation blocks and prisons. During the talks, it was possible to release the hostages, but the authorities met with a rejection of the demand to return to the cells, and since dusk was approaching, the decision was made to begin an assault on the isolation block building.

A special-purpose militia detachment, a SWAT team of the corrective works administration, and officers and ensigns of the internal troops took part in the operation.

Using special means, rubber truncheons, explosive packages, and weapons they penetrated the building and occupied the first floors. By midnight the situation was under control, but it proved possible to bring about complete order only this morning.

There are no injured or dead among the staffers of the law-enforcement bodies. Among those under investigation, there are injuries and one dead person. An inquiry into the incident is underway. [video shows exterior of a factory bearing the title "Elektrometallurg" and shots of uniformed men atop the building; then men behind bars looking out; other shots apparently from within the

confines of a prison yard, with individuals wearing riot gear entering the prison yard; shot of a stationary armored personnel carrier with a roof-mounted machine-gun and troops; other armed troops standing about; clergyman being escorted to building; talks under way, presumably between inmates and officials; then group of armed militia wearing bullet-proof vests, and carrying loudspeakers and shields approaching building; shot of an ambulance]

KGB Seizes Machine Guns Smuggled From Plant

PM1506103390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 14 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent E. Vasilyev under "Direct Line" rubric: "Machine Gun... Under Floorboards"]

[Text] Vladimir, 13 Jun—Can a machine gun be taken out of a plant past the main gate? If you ask the metalworkers of the Kovrovskiy Machine Plant such a question, the most candid of them will answer affirmatively...

Indeed, who can prevent it if the guards at the gate are in a state of slight somnolence and the metal detector ceased to work long ago? The takeout technique at the plant has been reduced to a fine art. Usually the requisite part, say a machine-gun barrel, is shoved down the waistband of someone's trousers. A raincoat or jacket is thrown over the top. If three men train in the required manner, they will be able to carry a whole machine gun out.

Recently a group of well-prepared comrades did precisely that. Unfortunately, their names cannot be published at present, since the investigation into the criminal case is continuing. Those who stole weapons from the plant workshops were fully aware of the future consequences, but the opportunity of earning a bit extra banished all doubts. Bloody tracks were left by these people—they led to one of the southern republics...

"What is the most dreadful thing about this story? As the investigation has shown, pilfering at the Kovrovskiy Machine Plant is an entirely normal phenomenon," A. Strekalov, chief of the USSR KGB's Vladimir Oblast Administration, recounts. "Here they regard their output in the same way as the produce of a pasta factory."

Not only weapons are sold in Kovrov, but also ammunition. Achievements in this field are graphically demonstrated—the mother-in-law of one of those under investigation did a gleeful dance at a family celebration, wrapping a machine-gun belt around herself. In this family they didn't simply indulge in fancy-dress balls in the style of the "Makhno boys" [members of Ukrainian counterrevolutionary group during Civil War 1918-1921] but also kept a real combat machine gun. It was awaiting its hour in a bag under the floorboards. It was not the only surprise in the same dwelling awaiting

staffers of the KGB investigation group—instead of the two machine guns they were searching for, they seized three!

Thanks to the timely intervention of state security and the police, the arsenal of weapons taken out of the plant's workshops did not reach the consumers.

Ryazan Oblast Party Chief Relected

*PM1506155390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2*

[PRAVDA information under general heading "Communists Deliberate"]

[Text] The 24th conference of the Ryazan Oblast party organization has ended. The political instructions to the delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress from the Ryazan party organization have been adopted. L.I. Khitrin was reelected oblast party committee first secretary.

Situation in Vladivostok City Soviet Cited

*LD1606181290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 16 Jun 90*

[By "freelance correspondent" Svetlana Shpilko]

[Excerpts] An extraordinary situation came about at the first session of the city soviet of people's deputies that is taking place in Vladivostok. Our freelance correspondent, Svetlana Shpilko, reports:

On 4 March, the first sitting of the Vladivostok City Soviet of People's Deputies of the 21st convocation took place. More than 100 days have passed since then. Twice the deputies have taken a time-out. On 5 June, they resumed their work. There are 17 questions on the agenda of the third plenary sitting. Only seven of them have been considered fully in the past two weeks. What happened last Thursday has no precedent. Comrade Fadeyev, chairman of the city executive committee, came forward with an announcement that the leadership of the executive committee was giving up its powers voluntarily and was resigning. What was the cause of it? I am quoting an extract from the announcement signed by Comrade Fadeyev, chairman of the executive committee, Comrade (Tyra) first deputy chairman; and deputy chairmen (Astafyev) (Burelomova), (Moskvichev), and (Folkin): We believe that the individual aspects of the policy pursued by the city soviet of people's deputies contradict the legislation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic on soviets, which is in force. The policy is aimed at depriving the executive committee of most of its rights and leaving it with just responsibilities. It does not facilitate the creation of the necessary management structure for the local economy, which is needed today. It does not provide the unity of action between the deputies of the soviet and the bodies of the city executive committee, which is needed so much in the present situation, and it does not create conditions for solving the tasks of the economic and social development of the city. [passage omitted]

It cannot be compared with any sitting of previous convocations, at which deputies simply raised their registration cards for and against. There are no indifferent people in the hall now. The slogan—All power to the Soviets—slogan is being put into practice not in words, but in deeds. While the deputies are spending their time in sessions, and are sharing powers and portfolios, the city is running down: Roads are poor, shop shelves are empty, transportation functions irregularly, housing is dilapidated. In actual fact, these and many other questions are not being resolved.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum

*PM1506155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinet under general heading "Communists Deliberate"]

[Text] Kiev, 13 Jun—A plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has been held. Its participants discussed the main issues of the upcoming 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

The plenum was addressed by V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Ukrainian Party Rescinds Decisions of 1940s-1950s

*LD1806214290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1740 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Text] Kiev, 18 Jun (TASS)—The Central Committee of the Ukraine Communist Party today rescinded as politically erroneous decisions adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Ukraine at the end of the 1940s-early 1950s on issues relating to the development of Ukrainian literature, art, and historical science. The Central Committee document states that they are marked by an authoritarian-voluntaristic approach to the artistic and creative process in the republic, and to scientific research on the history of the Ukraine. Implementation of these decisions led to substantial subjectivist distortions in cultural construction, and put a brake on the creative search of cultural and scientific figures. Predominant in criticism of works by a considerable proportion of well-known representatives of Ukrainian Soviet science, literature and art, were hackneyed accusations about "bourgeois-nationalistic character," cosmopolitanism, antipopular sentiments and formalism.

These decisions have in effect been annulled by life itself. However, a political, principled appraisal of them, the Central committee document points out, will help restore historical justice in regard to a considerable number of scholars and personalities in literature and the arts.

Party Official Views 'Very Acute' Problem

LD1806130290 Kiev International Service in English
2300 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Preparations are under way for the 28th congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine. At this forum the communists of Ukraine will analyse the activities of the republic's party organization over the past five years and will map out concrete ways of the party's steering out of the crisis, raising its role and responsibility in the process of the Soviet society's renewal.

On the eve of the 28th congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine—it will open on 19 June—our correspondent interviewed Ye. Dmitriyev, first secretary of the Chernovtsy oblast party committee.

[Begin Dmitriyev recording, in Ukrainian fading to English translation] In our oblast, as they say, the situation remains stable. I consider this is the result of the political work done by the party organizations, government and public organizations of the oblast. This is also due to the high level of culture in relations among people. Very acute for us is the problem of maintaining balance, civil peace and mutual understanding among all inhabitants of our oblast. This problem can only be solved through carrying out a vital nationality policy at all levels of political life. And secondly, the communists should work for the consolidation of all forces, so that internationality relations be harmonious. [end recording]

Ukraine's Masol Addresses Parliament

LD2505180390 Kiev International Service in English
2300 GMT 24 May 90

[Text] We continue with the account about the work of the Ukraine's Parliament session here in Kiev today. The session began with the report by the Ukraine's prime minister, Vitaliy Masol, about the political, social, economic, and ecological situation in the Ukraine. In part Vitaliy Masol said:

[Masol in Ukrainian fading into English translation] By this time we have made the first steps towards laying the foundation for a new system of economic management on the lines of economic reform, says Vitaliy Masol. It should be noted that it doesn't go easily because of hard circumstances. New negative factors emerged in addition to those which we have since the stagnation period. First of all, these are the poor disciplines in carrying out the plan, the (?flaws) in carrying out the mutual obligations by manufacturers, those in the work of the transport system because of the growing ethnic tensions in some regions. [sentence as heard]

Under these conditions the Ukrainian Government took steps to break the negative trends in the socio-economic development. Since the beginning of the current five-year plan period the national income of the Ukraine grew by 13.3 percent, whereas the growth of the labor productivity was by 16.6 percent. The average annual

growth rate during the last four years was somewhat lower than those in the last five-year plan period. Certain changes for the better occurred in terms of improving the financial situation in the republic, where the gross profit was by two billion rubles higher than the planned figure.

Yet the thorough analysis of the current situation shows that the profound transformations taking place in our society have not brought about a marked improvement in the living standards of the people, whereas the negative economic trends became stronger. Further, the Ukraine's Prime Minister Vitaliy Masol noted in his report that the main reasons for the slackening of the economy were the lowering sense of discipline and responsibility, a sharp worsening of the ecological situation, plus lack of economic incentives and the obsolete infrastructure of the country as a whole.

Life shows that we can free ourselves from the infrastructure forced upon us only by way of ensuring the state sovereignty of the Ukraine through its self-governing and economic freedom, continued Vitaliy Masol. All our problems came out of it, and shall be solved only on the legal basis of a new treaty among the Soviet republics which should be worked out as soon as possible, and also on the basis of the bill on the fundamentals of the economic relations among the Soviet Union, the union and the autonomous republics.

We are going to firmly abide by the following principles of economic sovereignty of the Ukraine. First, it's the exclusive ownership of the Ukrainian people of their land, its mineral resources, forests, inland and territorial waters, other natural resources and basic means of production. Secondly it's a free hand in determining the economic structure and methods of management of the social production, in carrying out the taxation policy and in distributing the national income of the Ukraine. Third, it's the right of working collectives to have business with partners in other Soviet republics and abroad on their own, on the basis of fair exchange within the limits of the law, whereas the priority should be given to the interests of the society as a whole. The fourth point is the need of creating the legal mechanisms for the protection of economic interests of the Ukraine and also of promoting its economic relations with Soviet republics and foreign countries. The fifth point is the carrying out of independent economic and social policies which will ensure the renewal and protection of the Ukraine's national authenticity in economic and cultural fields, the growing importance of culture in the life of the Ukrainian society.

It is quite clear that it is not enough to proclaim these principles. Without an exaggeration I can say that we should do a huge amount of legislative work to create a precise economic mechanism for work under the conditions of greater freedom of manufacturers and those of decentralized economic management in the Ukraine, said Vitaliy Masol. In his report, which lasted for an hour and a half, the prime minister of the Ukraine, Vitaliy

Masol, also spoke about the pressing problems in the field of ecology, farming, science and culture.

Ivashko on Parliament Chairmanship, Yeltsin

90UN2091B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 24, 13 Jun 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Vladimir Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent K. Grigoryev; place and date not specified: "Patience, Harmony, and the Main Thing—Work"]

[Text] [Grigoryev] Vladimir Antonovich, you just led the meeting of the republic Supreme Soviet for the first time as its chairman. How do you envisage the new parliament of the Ukraine?

[Ivashko] As quite different from the previous one. To some degree it reflects the situation in the republic. I have in mind not structural formations but attitudes in society, approaches, statements, thoughts, disputes, conflicts...

You know, you can say whatever you wish about the USSR Supreme Soviet, and it is frequently criticized. But I want to note that the very establishment of our first parliament is an immense learning process. For everyone and for me personally. In only a year of legislative activity many deputies changed radically: They did not cast off their previous views and convictions, but they began to think more in terms of the state and simply began to base their ideas more on the realities of life itself. And I think the Ukrainian parliament, while avoiding as much as possible the mistakes made in the country's Supreme Soviet, will have to take the same path toward greater efficiency.

[Grigoryev] Does it not seem to you that the first weeks of work have presented to all of us, that is both the deputies and the voters, many new and unquestionably unique individuals, beginning with the leader of the opposing minority, the academician-physicist Igor Yukhnovskiy from Lvov. Or, say, the professor from the Kharkov Polytechnic Institute who, incidentally, has been elected as your deputy three times. Or the young Kiev lawyer and psychologist Aleksandr Yemets who headed the deputy group "For Human Rights"?

[Ivashko] I agree with you. Remember also that these first weeks proceeded mainly in stormy discussions. No matter what we were working on—procedural questions or elections—there were almost always heated disputes and sharp polemics. Naturally, these already revealed to everyone the names of interesting and bright people about whom the republic had not known until then. And now imagine how many more people will be revealed to us when the real work gets under way.

[Grigoryev] During the elections of chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet most of the passions were

flaming around the issue of combining the two leadership positions. In your speech you asserted that you yourself consider it impossible to combine the duties of head of the parliament and first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, leading us to understand that you would raise this issue at the republic party conference.

[Ivashko] I think that for me, as for anyone else, it would be quite difficult to manage this kind of combination.

[Grigoryev] But how do intend to combine the work here and in the USSR Supreme Soviet?

[Ivashko] For myself I have made a firm decision: With the first rotation I shall submit an application and try to withdraw from the country's parliament, turning the position over to another deputy from the Ukraine.

[Grigoryev] In spite of all the uproar and constant delays it would seem that the republic parliament is gradually getting into its routine. The next extremely important item on the agenda is the adoption of a Declaration of State Sovereignty. What do you have to say about that?

[Ivashko] In my program, regarding the concept of the activity of the Supreme Soviet I said that I see my task as working for the good of a unified democratic, strong, and stable Ukraine. And, naturally, one that is sovereign. The kind where the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian state are the only masters of their land. This, in my opinion, is the fundamental thesis. From it, as from a root, grows a tree with branches that embrace all spheres of the life of the republic. In no case should we remain hostages of the departments and the departmental approach. Here I have in mind not only Union departments but also our own republic departments. We are speaking not about a replacement of a dictatorship of Union departments with a dictatorship of republic departments, but about overcoming, I would say, scraping away this dictatorship altogether, that is, about changing over in all spheres of life from vertical ties to horizontal ones. No sovereignty is possible without this.

Now about the federation. I am a confirmed advocate of the Soviet Federation, but constructed differently from the way it has been up to this point. A voluntary transfer of some of the functions to the Union Federation plus extensive development of direct ties among the republics—this, what one might call a bipolar Soviet Union, seems to me to be the most effective economically, culturally, and scientifically. Incidentally, this kind of approach presupposes complete elimination of monopolies held by anybody in whatever business there may be. We have prepared a detailed draft of the Declaration of Sovereignty but still I anticipate that it will be a difficult task.

[Grigoryev] One of the steps of the new parliament of the Ukraine which, in addition to all else, has to a certain degree shown the natural desire of the republics for independence has not gone unnoticed in the country. I have in mind the speech at the session and the decision

regarding the USSR government's draft concerning raising retail prices. I cannot recall a time in the past when the Ukraine permitted itself to express its disagreement with the Union government so openly, and on such a high level.

[Ivashko] I admit I had to make a decision about that speech. But I considered it my duty. Yes, it evoked a certain amount of reaction and was supported in a number of places and republics. But right away, as frequently happens these days, there was all kind of talk: The Ukraine is against the market; Ivashko is against the market. Nothing of the kind! I am firmly convinced that under current conditions the only way out of the crisis—and there are no alternatives—is to change over to a regulated market economy. True, the word "regulated" also evokes certain negative emotions, but what can you do if there simply is no other kind of market, for otherwise it is not a market but a crowd, a bazaar...

Incidentally, this is not the only thing we are speaking about. In one way or another we will have to change over to a regulated market anyway. Will prices rise? Alas, they probably will. But first let us think. How much of an increase? What amount? For how long? When? Until when?

[Grigoryev] At the same time almost from one day to the next a new high power is being formed in Russia and the Ukraine. The congress in Moscow and the session in Kiev have much in common as well as much that is uniquely their own. But I wish to ask a somewhat unexpected question. From ideas that are circulating now one might think that Yeltsin as one of the leaders of the opposition has reached his new position through the LEFT door. If one adheres to this reasoning, you reached your position as an important party figure through the RIGHT. But this, of course, is all arbitrary. But in reality? As heads of two republics you will inevitably have to deal with one another. Can you find a common language with Boris Nikolayevich? If you consider the question inappropriate we will withdraw it.

[Ivashko] I shall say at the outset that you are reading out of context somewhat. You know who stands to gain nowadays in any matter, and not just in the state or political arena? The one who wins is the one who shakes off stereotypes the most quickly. We are all held captive by them—you and I and others. Here you are making judgments about who came through which door—the right or the left. But what, actually, is the difference? The most important thing is where they have arrived. And with what.

And now about my relations with Boris Nikolayevich and the influence on them, let us say, of the structure of the new interconnections among republics. I think this. If a person came to this post and state relations could depend on his personal sympathies or antipathies toward someone else, this would mean that he is simply the wrong person. Whether we like it or not, such things must not be placed ahead of the interests of the people.

As for Boris Nikolayevich, we are working together in the USSR Supreme Soviet. I cannot say that we have developed any special relations that go beyond the framework, as it were, of ordinary communication. As a person, in some ways I like him very much and yet there is something in him I categorically reject. But I do not think there is any reason for, say, personal hostility between us. So we shall work together and search for mutual understanding, the more so since few have so many common affairs, problems, and tasks as Russia and the Ukraine.

Ivashko on Sovereignty, Democratic Bloc

90UN2091A Kiev *PRAVDA UKRAINY* in Russian
22 May 90 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Ukrainian People's Deputy Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, by V. Nikipelov; place and date not specified: "Being Masters on Our Own Land"]

[Text] [Nikipelov] Today many people are wondering when the people's deputies will finally begin to consider the most immediate questions. They are clearly dissatisfied with the rates of work of the first session of the republic Supreme Soviet. Did you expect people to drag their feet like this?

[Ivashko] I was generally convinced that the session could proceed this way in the initial period. I allowed for deviations only in the small details. And if one is to proceed from the reality of the present day, this is the way it should have proceeded. Now everyone is looking at the Russian congress and finding no fundamental differences.

The deputies brought with them into the hall the atmosphere of life around us in all its manifestations. And we should take a fairly calm attitude toward this—after all, they are to some extent a mold taken from our society. Although, of course, we should like for everything to proceed in a more organized way and also more ethically.

What are the prospects? You can see for yourself that with all the conflicts of various social and political forces there is appearing—slowly, to be sure—a constructive basis. But we cannot get by without creating Supreme Soviet commissions in the next few days, as the experience of the USSR Supreme Soviet shows us. Without them we will reach an impasse and simply waste time. These permanent organs should determine which problem to raise, dispute, and submit with a more or less constructive position for the consideration of the Supreme Soviet.

Moreover, such commissions are an excellent school of legislative work for deputies and also simply a school of life. This is not to be found in any of the textbooks. I saw how people changed right before my eyes during the time

the country's Supreme Soviet was at work. During something like a year the majority of them changed from rash parliamentary rebels with extreme views into statesmen aware of their responsibility for the decisions they make.

Previously the work of such commissions was, frankly, essentially pro forma. For the majority of documents were prepared either in the government or in the apparatus of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. And these commissions met for only a couple of days.

But now they must travel the entire path from the blank sheet of paper to the draft that must be distributed to the deputies in printed form. And as my year of personal experience working in the country's parliament shows, they are good for making notes in the margins... This is why, in my view, today the commissions are perhaps a more important organ than the session meeting. For there they work out the finest details and call in specialists beforehand. And in time the parliamentarians themselves become fairly good specialists.

[Nikipelov] But still there are two viewpoints regarding this...

[Ivashko] The first is the one we have already started to talk about: to immediately elect the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, his deputy, and the chairmen of the permanent commissions, and then begin to consider other issues. This logical scheme impresses me. One the other hand, one must also approach with understanding the viewpoint of the people who developed the draft of the declaration on Ukrainian sovereignty. Perhaps we should actually pass this document through the session and determine our position in principle and only after that approach the elections.

This is something to think about. Or take another aspect, when the Russian deputies at their congress insisted on a report from the republic government concerning the political, economic, ecological, and other situations in Russia.

In and of itself, as they say, such a report is not very constitutional; it has no legal basis. But at the same time people are thinking about this. So perhaps we should characterize the situation that has developed and adopt a declaration of sovereignty. It seems to me that we should choose some middle road and move forward along it.

[Nikipelov] Developing what you said about sovereignty, how do you envision the ideal Union agreement?

[Ivashko] Well, you know, this is a difficult question because it depends not only on us but also on the decisions of the other Union republics, particularly on which functions they intend to delegate to the USSR and which they do not intend to perform at all. I proceed from the idea that the republic should represent the entire spectrum of opinions and judgments about its position in the Soviet Union, we should delegate certain functions to it along with the corresponding funds, and

so forth. At the same time we will develop direct ties with other republics. Incidentally, we are already doing this with the Belorussians. The Russians also approached me recently in Moscow with similar suggestions.

Regarding your question, I especially wish to discuss one most important aspect. Today more and more frequently you hear the words "disfigured Ukraine," "disfigured Russia," "disfigured Baltics"... The Kazakhs and Belorussians, Uzbeks and Moldavians speak the same way about their lands... And all of them speak of their own situation as though it were colonial. But if all the republics, even the most economically developed ones, consider themselves colonial appendages, then where is the metropolis? This role is played by the departments which have almost unlimited power, whose control system has almost completely outlived its day now. This is the main thing.

[Nikipelov] And how do you envisage the economic and political sovereignty of the Ukraine?

[Ivashko] This question cannot be answered with just a couple of words. Sovereignty is determined by the system or, as it is now fashionable to say, the package of laws that encompasses all spheres of the life of society. The main thing is for the people of the Ukraine to become the full-fledged masters on their native land.

[Nikipelov] At a recent plenum of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee it was decided to recommend you for the position of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet from the Communist Party of the Ukraine. Could you briefly discuss the positions of your program?

[Ivashko] I shall not try to discuss such things with light pater, the more so since quite soon I shall be able to discuss this in detail from the podium of the session.

[Nikipelov] Vladimir Antonovich, how do you feel about combining the posts if you are elected head of the Supreme Soviet?

[Ivashko] Of course, in today's situation such a combination is an extremely serious thing. But, after all, you understand the situation with the party. How would my retirement from a party post look under the conditions of the unceasing attack on the CPSU? Betrayal? But I cannot betray the party which I entered deliberately and in which I believe. So if the deputies elect me as head of the Supreme Soviet, let the congress decide this itself.

[Nikipelov] Incidentally, what other decisions do you expect from the republic and Union party congresses?

[Ivashko] I think that at the congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine there will be a sharp, frank discussion of the situation in the party. In this connection the Central Committee will also be subjected to sharp criticism. The second aspect pertains to the role of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, both in our republic and the CPSU. We consider it fundamental that we are

the independent Communist Party of the Ukraine operating within the framework of the Program and the CPSU Regulations. Although certain communists insist on the creation of their own program and regulatory documents. I think there will be a large amount of discussion about this issue at the congress.

[Nikipelov] Every day lately in the square in front of the parliament building one might see dozens of yellow and blue flags and not a single red and blue one...

[Ivashko] So is this good or bad? You must understand that it is not difficult to bring 5,000 people with red flags here to the square. But for what purpose? What will these people do? Well, the one group has come with the task of exerting pressure on the deputies and the other—also to exert pressure?

Let us orient ourselves toward generally accepted relations in a law-governed state. The people have elected free people and they must work freely and calmly, performing the duties assigned to them by the electors. So why should we violate the principles we have just proclaimed for exerting any pressure at all on the deputies.

[Nikipelov] But at the same time the work of the "Democratic Bloc" here at the session looks much more organized than that of the bloc of communist deputies...

[Ivashko] I noted this tendency even in Moscow. It can be traced here as well. But its essence amounts to the fact that many of our ideological rivals, while rejecting the principles of democratic centralism in the Communist Party, immediately introduce the same kind of centralism and rigid discipline that were never dreamed of in the CPSU. And our party members are frequently very passive.

[Nikipelov] Vladimir Antonovich, what is your attitude toward the Democratic Platform?

[Ivashko] It is difficult for me to perceive it as a whole document. For it has no section at all on socioeconomic policy. And this is the pivotal point of the practical activity of any party; otherwise simply nobody needs it. We can argue about Mozart and Salieri, about Hegel and Kant, and about Socrates and Lao Tzu, but this is nothing more than discussion.

What is the basis of the activity of any party in our country or abroad? The way it formulates its socioeconomic policy, and tries to attract the largest possible number of citizens of its country to its attractive aspects. Now as concerns the second aspect—the construction of this party. The Platform does not mention Lenin once. From this one can draw the conclusion that Leninist ideology does not suit the leaders of this party and they are not trying to hide this fact.

Alas, the name and works of our leader have frequently been used to sanctify any action, as they say, for any case. Pull out an excerpt and put it wherever you want to. But still we must see the Leninist philosophy of socialism

and his approach to these issues. This is the main thing. And, paradoxical as it may seem, this philosophy was realized by those with whom Lenin struggled—the capitalists. It is not without reason that bourgeois scholars include Lenin among the geniuses of the planet.

I counted seven appeals in the platform for a multiparty system. As you know, this policy is quite distinct: A multiparty society is created. But recently I have even begun to ask foreigners if there is anywhere such a thing as a party that wants to create opponents for itself. The question evoked a smile, to put it mildly.

I understand it like this: If you do not like the Communist Party, go to any other one. But there is absolutely no point in trying to explode it from within.

[Nikipelov] But some kind of party will be created on the basis of the Democratic Platform, a socialist one or some other kind. In your view, will it be able to become some kind of ally of the CPSU.

[Ivashko] I think several dozen parties will be created in our country. They will be born, unite, break apart, and disappear. Such processes have already taken place in our country during the first years of Soviet power. We must stay calm about them. The political forces that will crystallize will be the ones with which we can find a common ground. But we must act reasonably, that is, not look for what tears us apart but find at least one or two points that unite us.

The main thing is to remember that we have begun to construct a new society in which all members will have all their needs met and will feel that they are independent citizens with equal rights.

Ukraine's Balkan Peoples Form Association

LD2605171690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0901 GMT 25 May 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Yefim Shvartsman]

[Text] Odessa, 25 May TASS—Representatives of the Balkan peoples who are living in the Ukraine have set up their own ethnic association. It was officially finalized today at a republican conference taking place in Odessa. The ethnic cultural-educational societies—a Bulgarian one, a Gagauz one, a Greek one, and an Albanian one—operating here have become the founders of the new association. It is not fortuitous that Odessa was chosen as the site of the headquarters of the Balkan Association: some 170,000 Bulgarians, 27,000 Gagauz's and many Greeks and Albanians are now living on the territory of the region of which this Black Sea town-port is the administrative center.

Linguistics Professor Ivan Stoyanov, who was elected one of the co-chairmen of the association's coordinating centre, believes one of the paramount aims is the creation, in places where there is a dense population of such citizens, of their ethnic rayons, rural or settlement

soviets, as was the case during one of the initial stages of the development of the USSR. These were abolished by the Stalinist regime.

The new association intends to organize its work in the closest interaction with the ethnic-educational and cultural societies of other peoples, of which over 20 were recently set up in the Ukraine.

New Research Group Founded in Ukraine

*LD1806092190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0600 GMT 18 Jun 90*

[Summary] A body has been set up in the Ukraine which "virtually switches to market laws a sizeable part of the republic's entire research effort": the Ukrainian Scientific Association. It has been created by scientists who believe that free competition among them will give a long-awaited boost to Ukrainian science. Corresponding member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Kislyy has been elected its first president. It will organize cooperatives, creative associations, and engineering, research, and scientific/production centers.

Chernobyl Cleanup Participants Meet in Panevezys

*LD1806075590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1900 GMT 16 Jun 90*

[Excerpts] Gintautas Jasiunas reporting from the meeting of members of the Chernobyl Movement which took place today in Panevezys:

[Jasiunas] People who took part in the cleanup of the Chernobyl accident gathered in Panevezys today. I am talking to Grazvydas Judelis, vice chairman of the republican Chernobyl movement, and Gintautas Papinigris, coordinator of the above movement here in Panevezys, about the issues which are being solved here at this meeting:

[Begin Judelis recording] Participants of the clean up of the Chernobyl disaster gathered here in Panevezys today in order to rally all those who became victims, we even can say that, and to elect our Council so that in future we could defend our interests and our rights. [passage omitted] We are trying to find out the number of those who became victims in this republic. [passage omitted]

It has emerged recently that people who went there have been shortchanged in many ways. The Soviet armed forces while recruiting people both against their will and with their consent to work in Chernobyl had promised them everything: they promised them apartments, cars, telephones and so on, and so on.

However, when the time for settling accounts came all these things are not there. People do not know who to turn to. [end recording]

Socioecological Union Formed in Belorussia

*90UN1824A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian
No 18, May 90 p 4*

[Report on an interview with the president of the Belorussian socioecological union "Chernobyl," Vasily Yakovenko, by SOYUZ correspondent Aleksandr Shagun; place and date not given: "New Ecological Movements and Parties Formed"]

[Text] Recent weeks in Belorussia have been marked by an increase in the ecological movement and by the formation of new organizations and movements. In Gomel, for instance, the Belorussian socioecological union "Chernobyl" conducted its constituent conference. There were organizational meetings in Minsk where the creation of an ecological party of Belorussia and a republic water association was announced. Their main goal is to rehabilitate the environment.

The new Belorussian socioecological union "Chernobyl" made itself heard quite widely. The union president, author and journalist Vasily Yakovenko, spoke to your correspondent and emphasized the fact that his union, or rather his party, was formed as a counterbalance to the official structures.

[Shagun] Excuse me, Vasily Timofeyevich, but both the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers of the republic has already done a great deal to alleviate the pain of the tragedy. And I did not even mention the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party. A new wide-range program was designed through their initiative and active support aimed to eliminate the aftereffects of the disaster.

[Yakovenko] But people still live in areas where the cesium contamination of the soil is 40 curie units per square kilometer. The children are terribly sick; the adults are suffering. And at the same time new villages and cattle farms are being built in the contaminated areas. As an example I can name the village of Mayskiy in the Mogilev area, and some residential complexes in Gomel Oblast at a total cost of R200 million.

I am convinced that the meetings, strikes, and storms of Council of Ministers offices that have swept across the republic recently were caused mainly by the absence of any help for the residents of the contaminated areas. There is nobody to help them defend their rights and interests.

[Shagun] What can you do then to make life easier for the people from the hard-hit areas if the authorities cannot do it? And the authorities have actual power and material and financial resources.

[Yakovenko] Very often it is not the indifferent official help that my compatriots need, but a kind attitude, involvement, and concern. Entire villages and kolkhozes [collective farms] are being resettled in new, clean places. But the people get scattered every which way. Some are

sent to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], others end up in different parts of the republic. Human relations are being cut through the quick. We have spoken against this deplorable practice. We started making arrangements for group resettling of workers and of kolkhozes to the clean lands. This was just one of our undertakings.

The second one, and perhaps the main one is the public control, the control of the quality and condition of radiation, the quality control of foods, and the offers of alternate proposals to the government offices of the republic.

Now we have started a fight for a considerable lowering of the radioactive contamination norms for agricultural produce. These "impurities" are accumulating more and more in the human body and more of various diseases appear now. So that we do not make mistakes, the "Chernobyl" union has enlisted well-known experts on radiobiology, radiation medicine, physics, officials of Soviet organs, and lawyers.

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Proceeds to Elections

PM0606140790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondents A. Simurov and A. Ulitenok: "Parliamentary Debates"]

[Text] Minsk, 4 Jun—The Belorussian parliament has begun its third week of work. The people's deputies embarked on forming the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's 23 permanent commissions. This is only the tenth item on the session's agenda. Parliamentarians are moving on from question to question amid heated disputes, clashes of opinions, and sometimes overt confrontation. This culminated in the election of the Supreme Soviet chairman, in which N. Dementey won with a bare majority. The simultaneous election of nuclear physicist S. Shushkevich as his first deputy served as a lesson in how to reconcile opposing sides.

Let us note that the young legal deputies V. Gonchar and D. Bulakhov, who are growing up literally before our eyes, have often helped coordinate various viewpoints in critical situations. The square adjoining Government House also constantly gives its "vote"—through impromptu rallies and a barrage of posters and flags.

Acquiring parliamentary experience, deputies have set up a coordinating group which has put forward candidates today for the permanent commission chairs. I. Smolyar, secretary of Gomel party obkom [oblast party committee], and Doctor of Biological Sciences B. Savitskiy were ratified virtually unanimously as heads of the "Chernobyl" and "Environment" commissions. Academician Ye. Konoplya, director of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Radiobiology, nominated for the post of chairman of the Commission

for Science and Scientific-Technological Progress, suffered a defeat that came as a surprise to many people. An alternative candidate—V. Karpenko, director of the Molodechno Powder Metallurgy Plant—was given preference.

Moldavian Deputies Set Up Dnestr Economic Region

PM0606151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Eduard Kondratov under "Direct Line" rubric: "Left Bank, Right Bank"]

[Text] Kishinev—A decision to create a self-governed economic region was made at the first congress of deputies from cities and rayons on the left bank of the Dnestr River and of Bendery City where, apart from Moldavians, many Russians, Ukrainians, and Bulgarians also live.

Despite a Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau announcement published in the press the previous day, and telegrams from the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet trying to persuade the Dnestr region deputies not to engage in an action capable of causing a new wave of sociopolitical tension, around 700 people's deputies of soviets at all levels—from rural to republican—gathered in the village of Parkany.

The deputies decided to create a single Dnestr Economic Region in order to resolve autonomously the problems of supplying its inhabitants with food and goods; to build its own housing; and to set up agricultural and industrial associations, its own commercial bank, and joint-stock companies. There was also talk of new, flexible production structures based on diverse forms of ownership, of leasing plants, and of encouraging small enterprises. Henceforth, as the congress declaration announced, the Dnestr Economic Region will be governed by a coordinating council elected from among people's deputies in proportion to the population of cities and rayons.

Although the deputies repeatedly stressed that the creation of the Dnestr Economic Region has nothing to do with politics and strictly conforms to the union Law on Local Self-Government, their position has earned the republican authorities' deep disapproval. In the words of V. Pushkash, deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet, the congress in Parkany is the latest attempt to reopen the question of the Left Bank's autonomy, in other words of splitting the republic, while the election of a coordinating council from among deputies is nothing but an illegal creation of an organ of Soviet authority in parallel with the Supreme Soviet.

The deputies' speeches testified to the fact that the political situation in the republic has directly influenced the decision on the Dnestr region's economic autonomy.

Again and again questions were raised about the nonrecognition of the tricolor as the state flag and about the need to improve the laws on language and on referendums.

The congress decisively rejected the resolution "On the Recognition of the Independent Lithuanian Republic," adopted the previous day by the republic Supreme Soviet, and adopted its own resolution condemning separatism and fully supporting the position of the country's president.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Chairman Gives Speech

90UN2074A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 27 May 90 p 1

[Statement by Mircha Ion Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet, made on 25 May 1990 at the first session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet's 12th Convocation]

[Text] Esteemed deputies!

Highly esteemed people!

I appeal to you in connection with the events which have been occurring recently in the republic destabilizing the social and political situation. They are a cause of joy for some and great concern and disquiet for the majority.

I have the impression, and I say this with all due responsibility, that all these disturbances are well produced and are being directed by certain destructive forces which are acting in some people's interests.

My reasons for this are the fact that:

1. This is borne out by the creation in certain cities of so-called self-defense squads and their attempts to provoke clashes last Sunday in the city of Bender. The intentions of such formations are demonstrated graphically by the storming of the parliaments in Latvia and Estonia.

2. There continue to be serious shortcomings in the maintenance of public order in the capital, in direct proximity to the Supreme Soviet building included. In this connection certain deputies are being subjected to insults which, of course, is to no one's credit.

3. When on 22 May a situation was created in Kishinev wherein emotional tension reached its apogee, not a single serious attempt was made to diffuse it on the part of those who could have gone out onto the streets and cooled passions. I would remind you that I was that day in Moscow on business. In the evening I was met at the aircraft steps even by a picket of excited people, and I had not even been warned about what had happened. I should mention also that it was not the first time critical situations had been created precisely when I was out of the republic.

4. The appropriate authorities are incapable of providing specific explanations for the causes and development of

this event or the other (this was demonstrated to us by the leaders of the pertinent departments at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet on 23 May). At the same time, however, extremist elements (with various headbands and otherwise) who have appeared of late are not being duly rebuffed. It has not yet been ascertained even who is leading these youths who are behaving so outrageously on the streets. It has even reached the point of beatings and killings (which are being seen by some as a direct sign of a deterioration in interethnic relations), but there is no answer as yet to a whole number of questions on account of the delay in the investigation of the said occurrences.

5. Nor was it fortuitous in this context that on 23 May deputies of the "Soviet Moldavia" group walked out of the session. This act was staged on the very day that we needed more than ever consolidation, understanding, and support. They resorted to some organized game to "teach us a little sense," as if we were some kind of children. I remind you that both I and my colleagues from the Presidium were elected in accordance with the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution and the standing orders of the Supreme Soviet. Why, then, in this case are we daily being subjected to pressure and being forced into clashes with the opposition? And all this is called parliamentarianism? It is regrettable, but some deputies simply cannot reconcile themselves to reality; that is, to the will of the people.

6. We are still in shock from yesterday's statement by P.A. Paskar. I do not know to what extent he was right.... I personally would not heap the blame on the session's so-called negative attitude toward the government to which he refers in his statement. Nor do I know how one might characterize ATEM's negative role in this action.

7. How much longer can we put up with the taunts of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA? Does the Supreme Soviet need such an organ? I believe that the time has come for us deputies to express our attitude toward it and decline the services of this publication.

I could continue these thoughts apropos the events of recent days. But this is enough, I believe. I personally am very worried by all these "surprises" and realize what unpredictable consequences they could have.

I understand that I bear full responsibility for all that is happening. But not only I, all deputies should be imbued with this feeling.

We have to diffuse the situation. In order to do so it is essential to abandon personal ambition, caprice, and dissension; be mature people in all respects, as befits the people's elect; and demand that the executive authorities, which it is essential to make subordinate to the Supreme Soviet and it alone, exercise their functions to the letter.

Since everyone is currently in a state of expectation (at a time when some people are making forecasts and engaging in propaganda), it would seem necessary to

appoint today even the chairman of the Council of Ministers (we have been without such since yesterday) in order that he might at the start of next week submit for examination by the session his proposals pertaining to formation of his cabinet. We cannot drag out the absence of executive authority at the republic level any longer.... I shall try at the evening meeting to present to you a candidate for this office. I ask your support on this occasion also!

In conclusion I request that the Supreme Soviet adopt an immediate decree concerning my personal safety (I have twice requested this of the Committee for State Security, but have received no reply). The draft of such a decision could be submitted by the Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on State Security and Military Matters.

Broadcasting Changes Envisaged in Moldavia

LD1506154390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 15 Jun 90

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Moldavia in Kishinev continues. One of the main issues on the session's agenda today was that of setting up a national television and broadcasting center in Moldavia. The first step the standing commission on glasnost proposed toward creating it was the abolition of the republic's State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. Television and radio, it was stated at the session, must be independent and reflect the pluralism of the people and party. At the same time, a point was included in the draft resolution on forming, within the membership of the parliament, a council to coordinate the work of the national center. Another bill has been prepared for ratification by the parliament: on abolition of the Moldavian news agency ATEM and the formation of the national news agency Moldova.

Moldavian Quake Damage in 'Millions of Rubles'

PM0506130990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Eduard Kondratov: "Earthquake Aftermath"]

[Text] Kishinev—At Thursday's evening sitting of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session, Moldavian SSR Council Of Ministers First Deputy Chairman A. Sangeli reported on the aftermath of the 30 May earthquake.

More than 1,000 apartments were damaged in Kishinev alone. Private buildings were particularly affected. More than 80 schools and kindergartens in the republic's capital and dozens of medical, trade, and cultural establishments will require repairs.

The earthquake had serious consequences in southern Moldavia. Some 90 houses were partially destroyed in Komrat and 54 in Chadyr-Lunga. Some 595 people in

the republic required medical attention, 31 people were hospitalized, and one woman died jumping from the fourth floor of a building.

Emergency repair work has begun and residents are being evacuated from dangerous buildings. The scale of the damage caused by the earthquake has yet to be established, although it is clear that it will run into many millions of rubles.

At 0400 on 31 May the people of Kishinev felt further strong tremors. This time they were around force 5.

Caucasus

37 Servicemen Killed in Transcaucasus Since Jan

LD1906100890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0757 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 June. (TASS)—Thirty-seven servicemen from the Soviet Army and Navy died as a result of interethnic conflicts in the Transcaucasus between 19 January and 18 June this year, reported KRASNAYA ZVEZDA today.

They include eight officers, three ensigns, 26 soldiers and sergeants, and also an ensign's wife. There were 28 Russians, five Ukrainians, one Belorussian, one Kazakh, two Azerbaijanis, and one Estonian among the dead.

Twenty-six people died at the hands of extremists and 11 lost their lives in accidents, including accidents in which security measures were breached.

Furthermore, 153 army and navy personnel were wounded or injured. Ten died as a result of their wounds.

Moscow Berated for Azerbaijan Disorders

PM1506102190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Special correspondents Z. Kadymbekov and A. Shinkin dispatch incorporating comments by Azerbaijan party congress participants: "The Azerbaijan Communist Party's Problems in the Eyes of the 32d Congress. To Be Able To See the Future"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Baku—The times that the republic are living through can perhaps be described today in one word: tragic. People who have been to Baku would not recognize this international, friendly city. It seems to have grown dark and has retreated into itself. The events in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKA0], the passions at the rallies, the long strikes, mass violations of law and order, injuries and deaths of innocent people in the interethnic strife, news from the scene of events that sounds like war communiques from the front... All this undoubtedly paves the way for serious alarm in the people's souls.

The participants in the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress reflected honestly on the following: Where are the sources of the conflicts, who benefits from the events in the republic, was it possible to avert the tragedy, and how can we emerge from the crisis situation and restore peace and calm in our native land.

Everyone had his own opinion on this subject. At times the points of view coincided and at times, on the contrary, they clashed like swords. Some people were guided more by their emotions, others by the logic of arguments and facts. Being an arbiter here is a thankless task. So we decided to let the congress participants themselves talk about the most painful points in the problems of the republic Communist Party.

T. Ismailov, general director of a space research science and production association and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

"The present situation did not become acute all of a sudden. Wittingly or unwittingly, the policy of the previous Central Committee, headed by Vezirov until the January tragedy, assisted in this. The Central Committee worked according to a classical plan: Moscow—Baku—the gorkoms and raykoms [city and rayon party committees]. Every time someone sneezed in the center it was echoed in the primary party organizations. Our party leadership did not have the wisdom and common sense to look at the course of events in the republic with its own eyes and note that copying things blindly has long been at odds with reality. Separate attempts to adopt individual laws did not lead to anything good.

"But this is what gladdens us now. The congress managed to avoid these old mistakes. The delegates are thinking about where we are going and how we are getting there. The usual massacre of the guilty has given way to a sober analysis of the current moment. The report itself was qualitatively new. Approaches to the formation of working organs are different too. So commissions were elected at the congress. Seats were allocated not on a percentage basis but according to ability in resolving issues independently."

A. Golubev, second secretary of Baku Gorkom:

"I would attribute the misfortunes primarily to mistakes in party work. The habit of obedience had its effect too. When there was an influx of refugees into Baku, the gorkom, for example, tried to adopt some kind of measures. But its efforts were not supported by the Central Committee. Another time we were reprimanded. So we gave up."

S. Mamedov, first secretary of Astarinskiy Raykom:

"The passivity of the CPSU Central Committee led to the tragedy. We in the localities started to miss the telephone calls from Baku. No, we certainly did not need to be ordered about on trivial matters when passions were flaring around us and mass disturbances were occurring: What we needed was a precise stance and a

clear aim. The Central Committee's voice was not heard. No one even knew what it was preoccupied with. Baku did not hear the voices from the localities. For example, people demanded to be able to communicate without unnecessary obstacles with their relatives in Iran. For a long time, Baku did not respond to this at all."

M. Kaziyeu, chairman of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Auditing Commission:

"When discussing the draft CPSU Statutes at the 28th congress, the delegates must consider the principles of democratic centralism thoroughly. And first and foremost make sure that it promotes not the bureaucratization of intraparty relations but the real participation of all communists in party life, and that formalism and "unanimous approval" are avoided. Unfortunately, for many years, the party maintained that we should bow low before important persons and "wipe our feet" on subordinates. In such an atmosphere, is it possible to display principle, independence, initiative, and responsibility?"

S. Musayev, leader of a P. Montin Machine-building Plant comprehensive team:

"I like the fact that the delegates are not relishing the mistakes made by the leaders who 'blew it,' but instead are trying to draw conclusions from them. But all the same, we need to talk about cadre work separately. This is the anguish of our people. Virtually the same people have been walking round and round the nomenklatura for 15 years now. It is an endless game of chess in which no pieces are lost. And how many righteous words have been uttered on this subject. For example, when Vezirov started work as first secretary, he furiously attacked so-called "Aliyevism." The heads of the innocent and the guilty rolled alike. But here is the paradox: Replacing them were friends and relatives of Vezirov himself, forming a "shadow cadre department" around him, which determined the way many questions were resolved. People who had at one time been removed from their posts and had spent some years in less important posts moved up again.

"An infallible way of raising our party's prestige is through cadre registration."

S. Alekperov, secretary of the "Ozon" plant party committee:

"Talks to the effect that party organizations in labor collectives are unnecessary seems to me to be groundless. Why? Today, when there is disorder and vacillation everywhere, the primary force is the real one, and it is capable of quelling emotions and assuming the role of guarantor of justice and calm in the collective. The work of our communists in plants during the latest events has proved this. In practical terms, we have managed to avoid a strike. There was not a single pogrom on the territory of our residential development. At the 28th

CPSU Congress, the rights of primary party organizations and their independence must be finally consolidated in the new party Statutes. The status of the party organization secretary is indispensable."

G. Glushkov, editor of the newspaper BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY:

"I, for instance, find the following fact surprising. Our Central Committee's draft Platform reveals the openness, glasnost, and truthfulness of the Communist Party's activity. And at the same time, the conclusions of the commission investigating Vezirov's activity during his work as first secretary of the Central Committee, which were recently discussed at the plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, were kept from the republic's communists. Surely the republic's communists should know in detail why he was so strictly reprimanded and had his registration card endorsed. But, apart from the information report, nothing was published.

"The press should give answers to any question, if the party calls on it to do so. But why do the inhabitants of the republic and the country still not know the whole truth about the January tragedy? Why, for instance, did the internal troops which were already in Baku not act during the pogroms? Who committed sabotage and wrecked the Azerbaijan television center? And why were the troops brought into Baku without notifying the city's inhabitants? This is also a question of glasnost."

R. Nuliyev, director of the 22d CPSU Congress Petroleum Refinery:

"A return to normal, healthy forms of economy—that is, to the market—is the only way of improving the people's living standards. But I would like to see more concrete material and real work instead of the usual "point out," "strengthen, and "require."

So we are operating on a lease. But we have no freedom. The state order is "stifling" us as before. It has become ridiculous. The consumers are not collecting the ordered products. We cannot sell them either. For this, we need to cross the "barricades" of higher departments right up to the government of the country. Over a month ago, we appealed to the Presidential Council for permission to buy out our plant for collective ownership. Again, not a word. I am saying all this because the current situation in the economy can be corrected either by dictatorship or by complete independence for enterprises. We have already "been through" one of these. It is time to work differently."

E. Salayev, president of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences:

"The republic Central Committee must achieve more constructive dialogue with the democratic movement in order to consolidate the forces of society and outline a program for getting out of the crisis.

The democratic movement in the republic is a reality. It must not be rejected, it must be recognized. The task of party committees is to unite all the social formations, teach them to work normally, and assist in organizing things."

A. Orudzhev, republic minister of justice:

"If we go right back to the beginning, then many the republic's problems stem from the problem of the NKAO. The Central Committee has not had a clear-cut position on this issue from the very beginning. Many erroneous decisions were taken which only exacerbated the problem.

"For example, nothing good came from transferring the oblast's industrial enterprises to the authority of union ministries and departments. The current tough stance on relations with the extremist forces, judging by the first results, meets the interests of the two peoples and the restoration of stability in the region. We must finally understand that the NKAO problem can only be resolved on the basis of the Constitution and the law.

"Listening to the speeches at the Congress, you realized that our public has many complaints to make about Central Television and the mass media. They are often guilty of being one-sided and subjective. Unfortunately, even PRAVDA did not steer clear of this."

Major General V. Safonov, commander of the NKAO state of emergency region:

"Nationalist forces operate on the principle that the worse things are, the better. Their refusal to cooperate with the republic organizational committee, and terrorist acts against servicemen bear witness to this. In the period since 15 January, four servicemen have been killed and 38 have been wounded. Fortunately, ordinary workers in NKAO have started to understand the extremists' plans. They want to live peacefully, grow crops, and raise their children. The government must show more concern for refugees of Azerbaijan and Armenian nationality who have suffered as a result of the conflict. But social justice must also be restored with respect to the 50,000 Azerbaijanis living in the NKAO.

"I support the congress delegates' appeal to the country's political leadership for decisive measures to be taken with respect to the unconstitutional armed formations in Armenia, whose dubious activities on the Azerbaijan border are causing great alarm among the republic's population and are preventing the situation from being stabilized."

A. Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and president of the republic:

"We have been through a terrible time. At the end of last year and the beginning of the current year it was as though we had found ourselves in a vacuum: The party workers were completely demoralized—from the Central Committee Bureau to the primary party organizations.

Elements skillfully stirred up by the worst forces in the people's movement were running the show. Every mistake that the Central Committee made was exploited and presented to the people in the appropriate light.

"Unfortunately, we ourselves provided many reasons for criticism. And the main trump card with which we were 'beaten' was the lengthy silence about the true reasons for the conflict and the provocative motives for the actions of forces and individuals who were kindling interethnic discord. Unconcealed nationalism and separatism were disguised as talks about the alleged infringement of the socioeconomic freedoms of the Armenian section of the population.

"The congress delegates justly also called the country's political leadership to account. The center's unclear position caused our erroneous decisions in the normalization of the situation, which essentially led to the deaths of hundreds of people in both republics. The two-year search for a compromise in resolving the problems in the NKAO has been fruitless. The congress delegates stressed this repeatedly. Evidently, in this situation the only alternative to a compromise is the strict observance of the Constitution and the laws.

"An urgent question is mutual relations between the Communist Party and the new political movements. There have been many discussions and much idle talk about this. The congress defined its stance clearly: dialogue and cooperation with everyone who brings peace and friendship to the people and who observes the Constitution and the laws. Following a number of meetings with social formations, the Democratic Congress has been formed and a consultative council has been operating at the republic Supreme Soviet. Everyone's task is to learn to hold dialogue unemotionally and without putting forward ultimatums, and, of course, without violating the agreements reached.

"As the congress delegates demanded, we will transfer the whole focus of work to the primary party organizations and delegate to them many of the rights of the raykoms and gorkoms. We will extend the influence of communists by creating a council of secretaries of primary party organizations and party organizations in places of residence.

"The congress has shown that, despite everything, the international and revolutionary traditions of the CPSU will be victorious in the republic Communist Party. Indeed, there are differences of opinion about the republic's sovereignty, but we support Azerbaijan's autonomy within the framework of the new federation. We look at the autonomy of our Communist Party in different ways, but we do not see it breaking away from the CPSU platform.

"As the Central Committee plenum decided, the congress has now suspended its work, but it will return to the discussion on its stances on urgent problems after the 28th CPSU Congress."

Azerbaijan Congress Decision on NKAO Reported

*NC1806124790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 16 Jun 90*

[From the republican press review]

[Text] It is common knowledge that the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress adopted a decision on the question of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The decision was published in the republic's newspapers today. The decision noted that the appalling development of the incidents in and around the NKAO is largely linked to the fact that NKAO's party and soviet organs followed the separatist forces, complied with their wishes, and (?created suitable conditions) for the extremist and nationalist movement. The decisions adopted by the country's political and state leaders aimed at normalizing the situation in the NKAO may have been practical, but they have not yielded results. The central authority, which assumed responsibility for resolution of the dispute, delayed the adoption of independent measures and decisions by the leaders of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. The USSR's Constitution charges the Soviet Union and President Gorbachev with the task of safeguarding the sovereign rights of each and every union republic.

The communists, who participated in the lofty party congress, demanded that the Soviet Union and the president of the USSR fulfill their constitutional tasks without delay.

Azerbaijan Road Transport Minister Approved

*LD1806102790 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY
in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 1*

["Decree by the President of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, SSR, on the Appointment of Comrade Aslanov A.A. as Azerbaijan SSR minister of road transport" BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY headline]

[Text] Comrade Arif Azi Ogly Aslanov is appointed Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] minister of road transport.

[Signed] A. Mutalbilov, president of the Azerbaijan SSR, Baku, 5 June 1990

Kel'badzharskiy, Il'ichevskiy Regions Attacked

Four Armenians Arrested

*NC1806134990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 13 Jun 90*

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs has announced that armed Armenian bandits attacked shepherds in Kel'badzharskiy and Il'ichevskiy Rayons and stole hundreds of sheep and cattle in recent days. Thanks to the measures that have been taken, many heads of cattle have been retrieved. Four armed Armenians were captured and firearms, signal rockets, and [word indistinct] were

seized during the special operations that were carried out. An investigation is under way.

Mamedov, deputy minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan SSR, and Major General Manushkin, representative of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, are currently in the rural rayons of the republic.

Tension Reported

NC1806142390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The situation in Azerbaijani rayons bordering Armenia remains tense. The situation in Kel'badzharskiy Rayon is particularly grave. Groups of bandits affiliated with the ill-famed Armenian nationalist army, which have massed close to the border of Kel'badzharskiy Rayon, have been raiding farming settlements, stealing cattle, and firing on peaceful people. Armed Armenians stole more than 2,000 heads of sheep and cattle in the past week alone, killed a shepherd, and wounded three of his sons.

Polyanichko, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee and second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; Major General Manushkin, deputy head of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops in the Transcaucasus and the northern Caucasus region; Major General [name indistinct], head of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry operations and investigations group; Colonel Mamedov, deputy minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic; and leading officials of the republic's ministry of communications and state committee for the agroindustrial complex have visited Kel'badzharskiy Rayon. They held talks with residents of the rayon and military servicemen who are carrying out the difficult work of obstructing raids by Armenian bandits.

A special meeting was held with the leading officials of the Kel'badzharskiy Rayon under the chairmanship of Viktor Polyanichko. The meeting examined the situation created in the border region and established concrete measures to obstruct the criminal activities of the nationalists in the neighboring republic and provide security for the livestock breeders who have arrived in farming settlements from other Azerbaijani rayons. A decision was adopted to dispatch additional militia units and military troops to the border towns and farming settlements. The units will be supplied with [words indistinct], communication equipment, and vehicles.

Azerbaijani Worker Wounded

NC1906123190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers report that fruit harvesting and [words indistinct] continues in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Field work is carried

out under the protection of military troops and the militia workers because people are afraid of armed Armenian terrorists.

In fact, the (?Gulluk) town in Il'ichevskiy Rayon was fired on with automatic weapons from the direction of [name indistinct] town in Araratskiy Rayon during the past few days. Mamed Mamedov a collective farm worker, received a bullet wound.

The workers have lost patience and are justifiably asking: Why is security not being established in the border rayons of the autonomous republic?

Central Asia

'Fragile Peace' in Osh as Death Toll Reaches 186

LD1906081490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0715 GMT 19 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent Boris Maynayevev report]

[Excerpts] Frunze, 19 Jun (TASS)—A fragile peace has come to Osh Oblast in Kirghizia which borders on Uzbekistan. Mass disturbances which ended in bloodshed began there on 4 June. Most enterprises are now working in the town of Osh, the oblast center and about 50 percent of public transport drivers have their buses back on the roads. Around 400 fire arms and 100 knives have been confiscated. In total, 186 deaths have been registered since the tragic events began and 1,054 people have been injured. Of that number, 773 have been hospitalized.

The situation remains complex in Uzgenskiy Rayon in the oblast. There is still confrontation between Uzbeks and Kirghiz there. Troops are managing to restrain both sides from bloodshed but the opposing sides are not seeking reconciliation.

According to preliminary figures the overall damage caused by the disturbances in Osh Oblast has been put at over 40 million rubles to date.

Frunze, the capital of the republic, where a state of emergency was also introduced on 7 June, remains calm.

Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet Session Opens 18 Jun

LD1806162790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 18 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The second session of the Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet opened in Tashkent today. [video shows session in progress]

[Correspondent M. Ganiyuev] The session began its work with a report by Comrade Mirsaidov, chairman of the Uzbekistan Council of Ministers, on the tragic events in Osh Oblast, Kirghizia. The majority of those who died

were Uzbeks. According to the latest reports the situation in Osh and in the five border regions of Andizhan Oblast, Uzbekistan, is returning to normal, but deputies demanded the urgent creation of a Union commission and a thorough investigation into the conflict. There are 21 points on the session's agenda. All of them are important. There are draft laws on both property and land, constitutional surveillance, measures on the transition to a market economy, and the submission of amendments and addenda to the USSR law on universal military obligation, and others. All of these have been discussed at commissions, but in the opinion of many deputies they require further work.

A number of deputies proposed that the adoption of a draft law on independence be entered on the session's agenda. A declaration on the sovereignty of Uzbekistan has been distributed. What is this? An attempt to leave the Union? [video shows deputies being interviewed]

[K.B.Bakhriyev, people's deputy of Uzbekistan] A number of articles in all-Union laws do not suit us. This is why we need a declaration on independence.

[Yu.N.Nishanov, people's deputy of Uzbekistan] I do not subscribe to the same opinion because our republic, our people are not ready for this declaration at present. [video shows the Supreme Soviet session]

[Ganiyev] Well, so it is. There is not yet a single opinion on this issue. But it is clear that it will provoke big disputes. The session of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan is continuing its work.

Uzbek Discusses Economic Independence at Meeting

*LD1806194590 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian
0115 GMT 17 Jun 90*

[Excerpts] Yesterday a meeting took place in the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee on the republic's transition to economic independence and regulated market economy. Senior workers of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, the Council of Ministers and the Gosplan of the republic participated in it. [passage omitted]

Karimov, president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the participants. He stressed that in the exceptionally complex conditions that have developed in the country it is now of paramount importance to resolve the economic problems. Among the tasks set by the 22d Uzbek Communist Party Congress there is the provision of real political sovereignty and economic independence of the republic. It will give Uzbekistan the opportunity to solve the vitally important questions of improving the welfare of its people, to plan and use fully and independently (its own) potential and resources in the interests of the workers of the republic on a mutually advantageous basis and to form relationships with the center, with other republics, and with foreign countries.

There was a detailed, businesslike and frank discussion on the questions raised.

Based on the president's decree, the formation of the main directorate for the supply and marketing of raw materials and produce of light industry, Uzglavlekhnsabsbyt, and the state committee of the republic for foreign trade and foreign contacts have provided the first specific steps for consolidating the economic independence and sovereign rights of the Uzbek SSR and protecting the interests of the republic. [passage omitted]

22d Uzbekistan Communist Party Congress Closes

Congress Examined

*LD0606165790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 6 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 22d Uzbekistan Communist Party Congress ended in Tashkent today.

[Begin recording] [video shows delegates assembling in front of large building, then talking in foyer]. [Correspondent M. Ganiyev] What has been going on these days at the congress? The cotton monopoly as, according to the delegates, implanted from above, from the center, and has led to the lowering of one's own production of meat, milk, vegetables, and fruit. As a result, the republic is among the last as regards the level of consumption of the main kinds of food. This has placed Uzbekistan's economy in unequal starting conditions. [video shows auditorium scene]

A resolution has been adopted here to the effect that the republic cannot as yet switch to a market economy, because raising prices, even of bread, will worsen the position even more. The congress sees the solution to the crisis as lying basically in the republic's political sovereignty and economic independence. All raw material and processing sectors in Uzbekistan must, it was said, be handed over to the republic, and the development of integration links can take place only on a mutually beneficial basis.

The congress adopted a resolution on the central committee's political report to the 22d Uzbek Communist Party Congress, the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress, "Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism", and the draft CPSU rules.

The delegates elected the new composition of the central committee. Comrade Karimov was unanimously elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek communist party. [video shows various speakers, including Karimov]

The congress agenda has been completed, but the delegates adopted a decision that the congress in its present composition will convene after the 28th CPSU congress to discuss the decisions, made there. [end recording]

Discusses Market Economy

LD0606154390 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT
6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Gladilov]

[Text] Tashkent June 6 TASS—Consolidating national statehood and ensuring Uzbekistan's genuine political sovereignty within the framework of a renewed federation are among the high priorities in the republic's near future, communists said at the 22nd Uzbekistan Communist Party Congress, which ended here today.

The three-day congress discussed a report by the first secretary of the party Central Committee and the platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th CPSU Congress, viewed by most as the basis for the consolidation of all progressive forces.

The congress adopted a resolution on the transition to a regulated market economy. The resolution stresses the need and necessity of introducing market relations. At the same time it noted that the transition must include a well-considered system of social protection for the working people.

In addition the resolution demands that any plan specify conditions in each republic at the start of the transition, in order to protect the population.

Islam Karimov was reelected first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee by secret ballot.

Warns Against 'Hasty' Change

PM0706114190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by special correspondents V. Artemenko, A. Kaipbergenov, and N. Kozhanov under the rubric "In Party Organizations": "Congress Over"]

[Text] Tashkent, 6 Jun—The 22d Uzbek Communist Party Congress completed its work yesterday. The delegates spent three days discussing the Central Committee's political report "On the Progress and Main Areas of Perestroika, the Tasks of Ensuring the Sovereignty and Economic Independence of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and the Place and Role of the Uzbek Communist Party in the New Political System of the Country and the Republic." After the discussion the delegates adopted a resolution on the political report, made suggestions with regard to the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress and the draft CPSU Statutes, and approved a statute on the Uzbek Communist Party Control and Auditing Commission. A resolution on the switch to a regulated market economy was adopted at the suggestion of congress participants. While supporting, on the whole, the principle of going over to market relations in the country, the congress pointed to the inadmissibility of hasty, ill-considered steps, particularly the raising of bread prices.

Sh. Mirsaidov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, briefed the congress delegates on the tragic events that had occurred in the neighboring Osh Oblast of the Kirghiz SSR.

An appeal to the communists and all peoples of the republic to strengthen the bonds of friendship and fraternity was adopted at delegates' suggestion.

After the end of the debate the congress proceeded to form the republic party organization's leading organs. The elections for first secretary of the Central Committee and members of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and Control and Auditing Commission were held by direct, secret ballot. I. Karimov, 52-year-old president of the Uzbek SSR, was elected first secretary of the Central Committee by an overwhelming majority of votes. At a session of the Control and Auditing Commission, Sh. Yuldashev was elected its chairman.

The congress adopted a resolution extending the powers of the delegates to this forum. With due regard for the results of the 28th CPSU Congress and the decisions adopted there, the republic Communist Party Central Committee is entrusted with examining the possibility, if necessary, of continuing the work of the 22d Uzbek Communist Party Congress.

The congress nominated candidates for central CPSU organs from the Uzbek Communist Party.

Uzbek Shoppers Deplore Temporary Curb on Sales

PM0606154790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by Sh. Ganiyeva and S. Ziyamukhamedov]

[Text] [Announcer] The Uzbek Council of Ministers has been forced to adopt a resolution on temporary measures to stabilize sales of food and nonfood goods to the population of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.

[Correspondent] Under this resolution a new procedure for sales of goods to the population has been introduced throughout Uzbek territory. [video shows people buying newspapers at a newsstand; camera focuses on resolution printed in the newspaper] Goods are sold only on presentation of a passport, a works identity card, or other identity papers. The inhabitants of Tashkent were doubtless aware that similar regulations governing the sale of goods had been introduced earlier in other republics. Nonetheless, this temporary government measure designed to stabilize the consumer market has evoked the following reaction here:

[Unidentified woman, waving passport] My attitude to this is very negative. It is preposterous having to take my passport to do the rounds of the stores, not to mention popping out to the neighborhood grocery. I need my hands free to buy things, how can I present my passport

at the same time? I walk around with my passport and don't know what to buy because the shelves are empty.

[Correspondent] And what is your attitude to the resolution?

[Second unidentified woman] I am in favor. This way there are at least some goods. Otherwise it is first come, first served...

[Correspondent] Let me note that this was the only positive reaction.

[Unidentified man] It is necessary to stimulate goods production rather than curb consumption. Do you understand? Only in this case will we solve the problem.

[Correspondent] What is your attitude to this resolution?

[Third unidentified woman] My attitude is negative because our store shelves are empty. Furthermore, it exacerbates interethnic relations, in my opinion. After all, we are all living in the same country. What do you do if you have to travel somewhere, or if guests come here? Besides, it is a nuisance to have to take your passport everywhere and to have to present your passport if you want to buy anything... I am against it.

[Newscaster] This miniature public opinion poll among the inhabitants of Tashkent confirms yet again that the root of all evil is the shortages. Only the resolute elimination of this phenomenon, which, as we can see, is giving rise to massive dissatisfaction, can resolve the problems in the supply of food and consumer goods to the population. And this, it seems, is possible by means of a healthy market economy, which will have to be introduced sooner or later.

Tajik Public Warned on Spreading 'Rumors'

LD1506224790 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik
0005 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the Tajikistan Ministry of Internal Affairs press center]

[Excerpts] 14 June—The situation in Dushanbe city has remained unchanged for the past few days. Eighty people were arrested for violating the curfew hours, 64 of whom are residents of Dushanbe city. During the past few days, from 20 criminal incidents recorded in Dushanbe city, 15 were exposed [as heard] [passage omitted]

Rumors have spread in Dushanbe city recently, alleging that the state of emergency and curfew hours have been lifted and that public disorders will be organized on 12, 13, and 14 June. These rumors are unfounded, because during the above-mentioned dates the situation in Dushanbe city was calm. At the same time we deem it necessary to state that in the opinion of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Tajikistan the spread of such rumors can never be accidental. The aim is to negatively affect the situation, to charge the atmosphere and create panic and anxiety among the population. Those who spread

rumors, in order to achieve these aims, cause instigation in public places and city transport. They reach homes of citizens by telephone (?influencing) people psychologically.

Therefore, it is brought to the citizen's attention that they have to observe peace, should not lose vigilance, actively fight against the spreading rumors and report all known incidents to militia authorities and the nearest guards and patrols. It should be kept in mind that the continuation of the state of emergency in Dushanbe city depends on your orderliness and further normalization of the situation.

Six People Die in Tajikistan Landslide

LD0706151190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1346 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By correspondent Galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe, 7 Jun (TASS) Six people have fallen victim to a large mud and rock slide that fell tonight from the Pamir Mountains onto the settlement of Komsomolabad (Soviet Central Asian Republic of Tajikistan). Many dozens of people received severe injuries and have been hospitalized in the local hospital and in clinics in the Tajik capital.

The descent of the mud and rock slides was provoked by several days of abundant rainfall in the Pamir Mountains. The tragedy was aggravated by the fact that the disaster overtook the mountain people at night. According to eyewitnesses, people ran out of their houses without immediately realising in the pitch dark where the danger was coming from, and not infrequently they ran right into the mud and rock slide instead of away from it.

The landslide also inflicted great material damage. Dozens of homes have been destroyed, along with administrative buildings, and social and cultural facilities. Power lines and many roads have been put out of operation. The government of the republic has formed an emergency commission to discover the scale of the disaster and provide aid for the victims. A group of qualified physicians and detachments for eliminating the aftermath of the disaster have arrived in the disaster area from Dushanbe. Motor convoys with food, temporary housing, and fuel are being made way for along the whole Pamir highway.

Kazakh Social Democratic Party Outlines Plans

PM0706123190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Colonel A. Ladin dispatch: "A Test of Strength"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—KAZTAG reports that the constituent conference of the Kazakh Social Democratic Party has been held in Alma-Ata. Around 100 delegates from seven oblasts participated in it. Within the framework of the republic's constitution the new party, together with other

democratic movements, intends to promote radical economic and social reform. It is opposed to national exclusivity and hostility to other peoples and defends market relations as the basic regulator of economic life.

It is planned to maintain close contacts with analogous parties of other union republics and foreign countries, and with the Socialist International.

Kirghiz Party Congress Ends, Biryukova Present

*LD1506164990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 15 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report from Kirghizia by correspondent Vladimir Fedorov]

[Text] The congress of the Communist Party of Kirghizia has assembled in a difficult situation. Suffice it to say that the permission of the commandant of the city of Frunze was required for it to be held. As you know, a state of emergency has been declared in Frunze and a curfew imposed. The events that have brought about this situation naturally have made an imprint on all the work of the congress, and have shifted the emphasis in the analysis of the republican party organization. After all, although the tragic interethnic conflict was provoked by extremists, it is directly connected—and this was stated at the congress—with the extremely troubled socioeconomic situation and the calamitous situation of young people and stockbreeders in the mountain regions.

Old slogans like "Increase and raise exactingness" will not radically rectify matters, although even now harsh command structures and diktat by the apparatus are prevalent in the life of the republic. Incidentally, extremely few mandates were obtained at the congress by ordinary communist workers and collective farmers. They had been squeezed out by various command ranks. The striving by the presidium to curtail the debate as quickly as possible evoked vigorous protests in the hall. Many delegates were disappointed by the depth of the analysis of the situation and the level of constructiveness in the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress, the draft rules of the CPSU and the draft action program of the communist

Its steering bodies and delegates to the 28th party congress were elected and candidates nominated for election to the steering bodies of the CPSU.

The congress was addressed by Biryukova, candidate member of the Politburo.

The congress now has ended its work.

Kravtsev Leads Kirghiz Investigatory Group

*LD1506174890 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—The USSR Prosecutor's Office has instituted criminal proceedings in connection

with inter-ethnic clashes in Kirghizia's Osh region, which claimed numerous casualties and had other grave consequences, it was officially announced here today.

A task force has been set up to investigate offences and expose the culprits. The group includes workers of the Prosecutor's Office, the Interior Ministry and the State Security Committee (KGB).

Beside law enforcement officers from Uzbekistan and Kirghizia, the group has more than a hundred investigators from the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and other union republics.

Soviet Deputy Prosecutor-General V.I. Kravtsev is coordinating the group's activities.

Kirghiz Youth Demands for Land Increase

*90US0977A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 23 May 90 p 1*

[Article by K. Karabekov: "Unauthorized Seizure of Land"]

[Text] There has been unrest in the Frunze region since the beginning of May. Rallies and assemblies have been taking place. Young people are demanding land for private housing construction.

The first menacing alarm resounded in May of last year. A rumor spread around the city at that time that refugees of Turkish origin from Fergana were arriving, and that they were obtaining keys to apartments immediately upon arrival. Young people rushed to occupy sections of undeveloped land on the outskirts of the city. That was the first time we heard the phrase "unauthorized seizure."

In order to avoid arousing passions, the government decided after prolonged vacillation to satisfy the demand for making sections of land available for private construction.

But it turns out that obtaining land is in no way the most important thing. Given the lack of development of our construction industry and the shortage of building materials, it is practically impossible to erect a home. Thus, of 10,000 people who obtained lots, only 1,500 individuals started construction. And there is just enough manpower and resources to throw together rough-and-ready shacks. Many are built without a foundation.

Yet the number of people desiring to stake out a claim is not decreasing. At a meeting with youth activists of the republic, the young people told the leadership they know how to get what they want if their demands are not met. Their statements involved direct threats toward the republic prosecutor.

And now a new splash—this time the tidbit in question was the arable land of the suburban sovkhos [state farm] imeni Kuybyshev directly adjacent to the southwestern part of the city. Rallies began during the May days of

celebration of "universal solidarity." The number of participants grows with every day. In contrast to last year, the majority of these are students. There are more and more outright demands being expressed with regard to obtaining land.

Under these conditions the republic government considered it possible to allot 240 hectares of sovkhoz land for private construction. But as of today—this is just a drop in the ocean.

It seems the events of last year have convinced our youth of only one thing—that they must converse with the government in the language of ultimatums. Demands are becoming increasingly severe with each passing day, and rally participants do not want to hear of compromise. More and more frequently the "dacha question" arises. There are cries among the youth calling for "fleecing the bourgeoisie." They say that having both an apartment and a dacha is too rich. Already we see attempts to encroach upon citizens' private property.

Appearing recently on local television, Chairman of the Kirghiz Council of Ministers A. Dzhumagulov stated that henceforth there would be no allocation of plots for dachas due to the severe shortage of land. There remains practically no vacant land in the city, and the demand for plots far exceeds supply. Meanwhile, the republic government recently adopted a resolution to replenish enterprises of the capital prior to year's end with young workers of the indigenous population from rayons of the republic. Naturally these people are not promised "apartment heaven." Alas, it is not difficult to predict

the wave of people desiring plots for housing construction which will follow. The army of individuals standing in line will jump by several thousand in one fell swoop. Of course, land could be allocated to them at the expense of peasant farmland near the city—but is this a solution?

New Turkmen Supreme Soviet Leader Appointed

*LD1706155190 Ashkabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 27 May 90 p 1*

[Summary] Today's paper publishes a Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Decision appointing V.B. Zhurmenek as chief of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet secretariat.

New Turkmen Central Committee Chief Elected

*LD1706155290 Ashkabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 27 May 90 p 1*

[Summary] Today's paper publishes a Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet decision on the election of Sapargeldi Motayev as chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic People's Control Committee.

Orazsakhmatov Appointed Turkmen Gas Supply Chief

*LD1706203990 Ashkabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 27 May 90 p 1*

[Summary] According to a Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet decision, Khalmukhammet Orazsakhmatov is appointed chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for Gas Supplies.